



THE  
**EDINBURGH REVIEW,**

OR

*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR

JANUARY, 1858. . . . APRIL, 1858.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY,

---

INDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOBIS RESOLVATUR.  
PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

VOL. CVII.

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, LONGMANS, & ROBERTS, LONDON;  
AND ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,  
EDINBURGH.

---

1858.



Warrington Public Library,  
Acq. No. 7523 Date 23.7.75

LONDON:  
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.  
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

## CONTENTS of No. 218.

---

	Page
ART. I.— 1. The Annals of San Francisco. By Frank Soulé, John H. Gihon, M.D., and James Nisbet. 8vo. New York: 1854.	
2. California Indoors and Out; or, How we Farm, Mine, and Live generally in the Golden State. By Eliza W. Farnham. 8vo. New York: 1856.	
3. California and its Resources. By Ernest Seyd. 8vo. London: 1858,	295
II.— 1. A History of the Church of Russia. By A. N. Mouravieff. Translated by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, B.A. Oxford: 1842.	
2. A History of the Holy Eastern Church. By the Rev. John Mason Neale, M.A. General Introduction and Patriarchate of Alexandria. 4 vols. London: 1848–51.	
3. 'Ο Συνοδικὸς Τόμος, ἡ περὶ Ἀληθείας. Athens: 1852.	
4. Dissertations on Subjects relating to the 'Orthodox' or 'Eastern Catholic' Communion. By William Palmer, M.A. London: 1853.	
5. Papal Aggression in the East: or the Protestantism of the Oriental Churches. Edinburgh: 1856.	
6. Περί Δογμάτων, Διοικήσεως καὶ Ἱερουργιῶν τῆς Ἀγ- γλικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Πονημάτων Κοσίνου Ἐπισκόπου Δυνέλμου, κ.τ.λ. ἐκδιδόντος Φρεδερίκου Μερρίκου, Τ. Δ. Oxford. 1856,	322
III.— 1. Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire (faisant suite à l'Histoire de la Révolution Française). Par Monsieur A. Thiers. 17 vols. Paris: 1845–58,	358
IV.— 1. The Life of George Stephenson, Railway Engineer. By Samuel Smiles. 3rd edition. London: 1857,	396
V.— The Works of the late Edgar Allan Poe: with a Memoir by Rufus Wilmot Griswold, and notices of his Life and Genius by N. P. Willis and J. R. Lowell. 4 vols. New York: 1857,	419

	Page
VI.—Speeches on Social and Political Subjects, with historical Introductions. By Henry Lord Brougham, F.R.S. 2 vols. 12mo. London and Glasgow: 1857, . . . . .	443
VII.—History of Civilization in England. By Henry Thomas Buckle. Vol. I. London: 1857, . . . . .	465
VIII.—1. A Journey through the kingdom of Oude in 1849–50, by direction of the Right Honourable the Earl of Dalhousie, Governor-General; with private correspondence relative to the annexation of Oude to British India, &c. By Major-General Sir W. H. Sleeman, K.C.B., Resident at the Court of Lucknow. 2 vols. 1858.	
2. A Personal Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow, from its Commencement to its Relief by Sir Colin Campbell. By L. E. Ruutz Rees, one of the surviving defenders. London: 1858, . . . . .	513
IX.—1. Earl of Clarendon's Speech in the House of Lords on the recent Communications with the French Government. March.1. 1858. London: 8vo.	
2. A Bill for the Better Government of India. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 18th February, 1858.	
3. A Bill to Transfer the Government of India from the East India Company to Her Majesty the Queen. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 26th March, 1858, . . . . .	540

---

#### ERRATUM.

Page 298, line 25, for "ice" read "sea."

## CONTENTS OF No. 217.

	Page
ART. I.—1. General Report on the Administration of the several Presidencies and Provinces of British India during the Years 1855–56. Calcutta: 1857.	
2. India and Europe compared, being a popular view of the present State and future Prospects of our Eastern Continental Empire. By Lieut.-General Briggs, F.R.S. London: 1857.	
3. Statistical Papers, illustrated by Maps, relating to India, recently prepared and printed for the Court of Directors of the East India Company. Printed for the House of Commons: April, 1853, . . .	1
II.—History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. By Henry Hart Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. 6 vols. London: 1854–55, . . . . .	51•
III.—1. An Appeal to the Scottish People, on the Improvement of their Scholastic and Academic Institutions. By John Stuart Blackie, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Marischal College, Aberdeen. 1846.	
2. On the Advancement of Learning in Scotland: a Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Provost and Town Council of Edinburgh, Patrons of the University. By John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek. 1855.	
3. Report of the Committee of the Faculty of Advocates on University Instruction in Law. 1855.	
4. Inaugural Discourse delivered to the Graduates of King's College, Aberdeen, on his installation as Lord Rector. By John Inglis, LL.D., Dean of the Faculty of Advocates. 1857.	
5. Mittheilungen über das Unterrichtswesen Englands und Schottlands. Von Dr. J. A. Voigt. Halle: 1857.	
6. The historically received Conception of the University, considered with especial reference to Oxford. By Edward Kirkpatrick, M.A. Oxon: 1857, . . .	88

	Page
— The Angel in the House. By Coventry Patmore. Second edition. 2 vols. London: 1857, .	121
V. — Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox. Edited by Lord John Russell. Vol. IV. London: 1857, .	134
VI. — Tom Brown's Schooldays. By an Old Boy. 4th edition. Cambridge: 1857, .	172
VII. — Mémoires et Journal sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de Bossuet. Publiés pour la première fois d'après les Manuscrits autographes de l'Abbé Le Dieu, et accompagnés d'une Introduction et de Notes par M. l'Abbé Guettée. 4 vols. Paris: 1856-57, .	194
VIII. — Histoire des Livres Populaires, ou de la Littérature du Colportage, depuis le XV <sup>me</sup> Siècle jusqu'à l'Éta- blissement de la Commission de l'Examen des Livres du Colportage (30 Novembre 1852). Par M. Charles Nisard, Secrétaire-adjoint de la Commis- sion. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1854, .	232
IX. — Tracts and other Publications on Metallic and Paper Currency. By the Right Honourable Lord Over- stone. 8vo. 1857. Collected by J. R. McCulloch, Esq. [Not published] .	248



THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,  
JANUARY, 1858.

---

---

N<sup>o</sup>. CCXVII.

---

---

- ART. I. — 1. *General Report on the Administration of the several Presidencies and Provinces of British India during the Years 1855-56.* Calcutta: 1857.
2. *India and Europe compared, being a popular view of the present State and future Prospects of our Eastern Continental Empire.* By Lieut.-General BRIGGS, F.R.S. London: 1857.
3. *Statistical Papers, illustrated by Maps, relating to India, recently prepared and printed for the Court of Directors of the East India Company.* Printed for the House of Commons: April, 1853.

THE instability of the British Empire in India is an idea so unfamiliar to the vast majority of our countrymen in the present generation, that if the events of the past year had not given to that expression a significance it never had before, the words would scarcely fall from the lips of an Englishman. More than half a century has elapsed since the wars which established our military and political supremacy from the confines of Mysore to the North-western Provinces of Bengal, and expanded the governments of Clive and Warren Hastings into the empire of Lord Wellesley. The system of native alliances, which gives to the whole of India the aspect of a vast confederation under the control of our own paramount authority, has long been completed. In our own days we have seen the most formidable army which could disturb the peace of India, vanquished on the fields of Ferozeshah and Sobraon, and our dominions extended without opposition from the Indus to the Irrawaddy. The proud inscriptions which are wont to decorate the marble halls of Oriental palaces, seemed not inappropriately

to describe the sovereignty of that Company which had raised itself above the thrones of the East; whilst a nobler and more generous sentiment led us to believe that it is the glorious destiny of England to govern, to civilise, to educate, and to improve the innumerable tribes and races of men whom Providence has placed beneath her sceptre. Such were the impressions common to the minds of those who knew the marvellous tale of the Anglo-Indian Empire. Yet these, it must be confessed, were far less numerous than they ought to have been. To the mass of the people of England the highly artificial structure of the Indian government is a thing unknown; and to men engaged in the animated scenes of English public life, the forms of Indian administration are singularly unattractive. India has been regarded as a distant station for troops, as a provision for the younger sons of Scotch directors, as an investment of stock, or as the last resource of aspiring lawyers and despairing maids, rather than as the scene of some of our greatest national achievements and national interests. But to all who took this superficial view of our Indian possessions, the precarious tenure of this great prize was even less known than its magnitude and its splendour; and the occurrences which have so recently agitated the North-western Provinces of Bengal, first roused a very large portion of the people of this country to the knowledge of what they hold, and to the conditions on which they hold it. These events have already dissipated our indifference, though they have not dispelled our ignorance. Let us hope that as this imperial connexion exists between the people of these islands, contending in the van of Christian liberty, and the people of Hindostan, in their poverty, their heathenism, and their subjection, we may learn to perpetuate it—not by a blind confidence in their fidelity or in our own resources, but by a clearer knowledge of our duties and our dangers.

Not such were the opinions of the most eminent men whose lives have been devoted to the consolidation and government of this great dependency. The consciousness of the superior power of their own country and the superior claims of their own civilisation never blinded them to the incalculable difficulties of the task which lay before them. They early perceived that the edifice of British power, which they had raised, rested only on the surface of the soil of India, or on the support it derived from foreign arms or foreign energy. Before them and around them lay the countless millions of the unchangeable East, subdued by the resolute will and by the administrative skill of their Christian masters; but retaining all the essential characteristics of the native character, of an-

quisite to enable the Company to support the charges of the Government of India. But to this it was replied that these privileges were enjoyed by the Company at the expense of the trading community, and of the people of England; and that whatever advantage the Company derived from a monopoly of the trade of the East, was an indirect tax levied on Great Britain for the maintenance of the Government of Hindostan. Moreover, whilst it was contended by one class of writers that the political revenue of the Company was assisted by its trading operations, Mr. Rickards argued in the House of Commons that there was a loss on the trading operations of the Company which was paid out of the taxes of India. The truth is, that the China trade and the tea monopoly was the only part of the Company's trade which proved remunerative; and immense sums were lost in Hindostan in the attempt to support native manufactures against European competition.\* Under another form—that of the opium monopoly—which enables the Company as growers of the poppy to extract nearly five millions of revenue from the population, not of India, but of China,—it may still be affirmed that the China trade is the principal resource to cover the deficiency of the public revenue of India; and it is one of the worst aspects of this question that the Government of India should be to such an extent dependent on an evasion of the law of a foreign state, liable to be interrupted by war, or extinguished by a change in the policy of the Chinese Government. On the renewal of the charter in 1833, the commercial element disappeared, and the stock of the Company was commuted into a charge on the territorial revenue of India, and an accumulating fund in this country.

In the eyes of some of the most eminent statesmen who have governed India, among whom we may reckon Lord Wellesley, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Dalhousie, it has appeared that the gradual extension of our territories, either by the successful results of war or by the failure of issue to the native rulers of adjacent states, is a just and natural mode of providing for the increasing demands of the Indian treasury.† On many grounds, and espe-

---

\* It was shown that in the fifteen years, 1814–15 to 1828–29, there had been a loss on the Indian trade of 278,707*l.*, and upon the China trade a gain of fifteen millions and a half.

† In discussing the policy of the annexation of the State of Nagpore, Mr. Mansel, the Resident, stated very clearly the grounds of these measures. 'The considerations in favour of these are the financial exigency of the British Government in India, which is called upon to afford military protection to all India, while so large a portion of the

~~disasters which have befallen India~~

See also

7523

See

23.7.75



cially with a view to the welfare of the people of India, such measures may be not only defensible, but necessary. Yet looking at them in a purely financial point of view, it cannot be said that the acquisition of territory has augmented the disposable revenue of the Empire, because the charges have always kept pace with, and sometimes exceeded, the income. And here it may be remarked that where the State annexed is fertile and wealthy, as in the case of Berar, the dominions of the extinct Bhoonsla family, annexation to the British dominions soon becomes unpopular because a large portion of the revenue collected is diverted from local to imperial purposes, and is in fact employed as a set-off against the increased expenditure in less productive districts; so that in proportion as we may gain in money we spread disaffection, and the people, though better governed, are more discontented.

Again, one of the expedients to which the Revenue Boards have been driven is that of 'resumption,' a system by which the Government challenges the titles of those holding lands free of rent charge, harassing them with legal proceedings, taking advantage of every technical defect under its own regulations and in its own courts, and frequently succeeding in selling up zemindaries at a nominal price, the agents of the Company being the only purchasers. It is certain that many gross abuses of this kind have occurred; indeed, in several instances these proceedings have been reversed, upon judicial investigation in this country, and tardy justice has been done to the sufferers by the interposition of the Queen's authority. But the advantage accruing to the Indian treasury from such transactions is more than compensated by the sums squandered in litigation, and by the bitter resentment left in the hearts of the people.\* It is true that after the introduction of the permanent settlement of Bengal, many frauds and abuses were committed, and unfounded claims were set up by some Lakhiraj-dars to establish their exemption from revenue payments; but the lapse of time might fairly be pleaded in bar of this exceptional jurisdiction, and we believe these resumptions, as well as the resumptions of Enamdars in Western India, to be highly impolitic. We are aware that the principle

'country makes no, or but an inadequate, contribution to the charge; the difficulty of providing the machinery of good government for any permanence; and the advantage of having as few irregular troops of native states to occupy our attention as possible.'

\* The number of these cases of *maafee* tenure, lapsed or resumed, in the North-west Provinces of Bengal only, in 1855-6, amounted to no less than 41,768 acres lapsed, and 18,746 resumed.

of resumption has been sanctioned and stoutly defended by some of the greatest Indian statesmen, as Munro and Metcalfe, on the ground that no altumghen grants were perpetual under the native princes, and that exemption from land-tax means in India total exemption from taxation—a claim which no man who enjoys the protection of Government has a right to advance. Nevertheless, these grants having been recognised as *property*, it is too late to invade them; though as property they might be subjected with entire justice to another mode of taxation: and we think that Sir John Malcolm's proposal of levying a succession duty on land claiming to be rent free, is equitable, judicious, and practical. It may be added that the principle of a duty on legacies and inheritance is one which might touch the personal property of India, especially since the power of making wills has been extended to Hindoos. In the ancient theory of the Hindoo family no transfer of property could be said to take place on death, and the operation of such a law would still be partial.

In truth, neither commerce, nor conquest, nor the economy recommended by the Court of Directors, nor the severity with which native rights have in some instances been dealt with, have at all corrected the inherent disproportion between the revenue and the expenditure of India—the revenue being raised from natives and spent by Europeans. There lies the permanent weakness of our administration, the heaviest drag on the stability of our Eastern Empire; to this may readily be traced the shortcomings of our administrations, and the defects in our civil and military system, curable, indeed, by an appeal to the energy and wealth of the British nation, but not curable by the resources of India alone. Before, however, we apply these considerations to the present and the future, let us rapidly survey the past; for if there be one thing more constant than the delusive prospect of a surplus Indian revenue, it is the reality of an increasing deficiency.

Clive had announced, when first he acquired possession of the Lower Provinces of Bengal, that the Company was now assured of inexhaustible riches, since the revenue of the territory was two millions sterling, and the expenditure could never exceed one million, even in time of war; within ten years Warren Hastings complained that the revenue of India was inadequate to meet the expenditure; Mr. Francis declared that it would be found the Government of India had been living on its capital; and the Company had recourse to Parliament for a loan of 1,400,000*l*. In 1793 Mr. Dundas entertained the same hopes as Clive, and even announced to the House of Commons the

intended distribution of the splendid returns of India. No returns reached England, and the debt steadily augmented. Again, in 1803, Lord Castlereagh, who had succeeded to the Board of Control, held the same encouraging language, and ventured 'to express his firm conviction that with our prospects of revenue, the Indian surplus would more than cover a war expenditure.' Yet during the brilliant successes, and under the sagacious control of Lord Wellesley, at this same period, the debt of India increased from seventeen millions to thirty-one millions and a half; and such was the distress in which Lord Cornwallis, his immediate successor, found the Indian Government, that he was obliged to retain the treasure the Directors had exported from this country to China, and to write home,— 'that every part of the army, and every branch of the public departments attached to it, even in their present stationary positions, are suffering distress from an accumulation of arrears, and I hardly know how the difficulties of providing funds are to be surmounted.' Lord Hastings declared, at the close of his long administration, that he saw no reason there should not be an annual surplus of four millions, though Mr. St. George Tucker, who reviewed the financial condition of India in 1824, in a spirit most friendly to the resources of the Company, admitted that he failed to discover the grounds on which these promises had been made, and reckoned the surplus in 1822–23 at two millions, minus a million and a half to be deducted for home charges. The same expectations were expressed by Lord Glenelg, though in a more moderate tone, on the renewal of the charter in 1833; and in spite of the wars in which Lord Auckland, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Hardinge found themselves successively engaged, each of them seems to have cherished a hope that the result of their acquisitions would be to balance the expenditure and revenue of India. The truth is, that twice only, during a brief interval of peace, has this end been attained. Sir Robert Peel, with a deeper insight into the state of the finances of India, had not hesitated to declare in 1842, that their disordered condition might compel the Imperial Government to meet the deficiency. Lastly, to bring this rapid survey down to the present time, we find Lord Dalhousie holding in the minute which closed his memorable administration, the same exaggerated language of the financial additions to the wealth of the Empire, though he seems to have anticipated a constantly increasing deficit with a complacency we cannot share.

By the several territorial acquisitions which have just been enumerated, a revenue of not less than four millions sterling has been added to the annual income of the Indian Empire.

‘ Stated in general terms, the revenue of India has increased from 26,000,000*l.* in 1847-48, to 30,000,000*l.* in 1854-55; and the income of the present year, exclusive of Oude, has been estimated at the same amount of 30,000,000*l.* sterling.

‘ Without entering into any close detail, it may be stated that the main sources of revenue are not less productive than before; while the revenue derived from opium has increased from 2,730,000*l.* in 1847-48, to 4,700,000*l.* in 1854-55, and is estimated at upwards of 5,000,000*l.* for the present year.

‘ During the years 1847-48, and 1848-49, the annual deficiency which had long existed, still continues to appear in the accounts. But in each of the four following years the deficiency was converted into a surplus varying from 360,000*l.* to nearly 580,000*l.*

‘ During the years 1853-54, and 1854-55, there has again been a heavy deficiency, and the deficiency of the present year is estimated at not less than 1,850,000*l.*

‘ But these apparent deficiencies are caused by the enormous expenditure, which the Government is now annually making upon public works, designed for the general improvement of the several provinces of the Indian Empire.

‘ Wherefore a large annual deficiency must and will continue to appear, unless the Government shall unhappily change its present policy, and abandon the duty which I humbly conceive it owes to the territories intrusted to its charge. The ordinary revenues of the Indian Empire are amply sufficient, and more than sufficient, to meet all its ordinary charges; but they are not sufficient to provide for the innumerable and gigantic works which are necessary to its due improvement. It is impossible to effect, and absurd to attempt, the material improvement of a great empire by an expenditure which shall not exceed the limits of its ordinary annual income.’\*

We assume it, therefore, to be proved that, although in some few years of peace and prosperity a surplus has been applied to the reduction of the Indian debt, yet the deficiencies have far exceeded the surplus: the debt has gone on to increase, and the Indian Government has been compelled, by the necessities of its position, to live beyond its income. It is superfluous to

---

\* But the gross charges of the Indian territory have augmented in a greater proportion than the receipts. The average annual deficiency, after defraying all charges both abroad and at home, in the last five years of the Charter, which terminated in 1814, was £134,662.

In the five years ending 1818-19	-	-	736,853.
----------------------------------	---	---	----------

In the five years ending 1823-24	-	-	27,531.
----------------------------------	---	---	---------

In the five years ending 1828-29	-	-	2,878,031.
----------------------------------	---	---	------------

(*Report of Select Committee of Commons, 1832, p. 34.*)

And to this estimate may be added

In the ten years ending 1850	-	-	-	1,474,195.
------------------------------	---	---	---	------------

Lord Dalhousie, when he speaks of four millions added to the annual income of the Indian Empire, omits the debit side of the account.

add that the events of the past year must largely augment this deficit, both by the loss of revenue and by the increase of expenditure. Civil war has broken out in the North-western Provinces, producing in land revenue near five millions a year; the treasuries, containing large amounts of specie, have been plundered; the collection of revenue is interrupted in almost every village from Umballah to Allahabad, the country itself is partly laid waste; and meanwhile the Government has to support the burden of that most fatal of all wars, when the combatants on both sides are fighting at its own expense and in the heart of its own cities and territories. We do not now propose to dwell upon these occurrences. The most important and essential part of this great subject, and the consideration which has led us to submit these facts to our readers, concerns *the future resources of the Government of India*. The questions on which the future fate of that portion of the British Empire depends appear to us to reduce themselves to these: Can we obtain from India revenue adequate to support the military and civil establishments which the altered position of our Eastern Government demands? or, Can we confine our military and civil expenditure to the standard of the revenue of India? If the answers to both these questions were in the negative, we should be irresistibly led to the alternative that the Government of India must be supported by taxes levied on the people of this country, or that it cannot be supported at all. But, on the other hand, we hope to show that, whilst we acknowledge the full extent of this difficulty, one course is open by which the enterprise and capital of this country may surmount it, and the revenues of India may be permanently increased. Such is the drift of the inquiry we are pursuing; but ere we can arrive at these tangible results we must entreat the patience of our readers to the details through which we hope to reach them, and for this purpose we proceed to examine the principal elements of the revenue and expenditure of India.

The estimate of the gross revenue of India for the year ending April, 1857, shows that the total amount of income raised by the Indian Government is nearly thirty millions sterling—the exact sum is taken at 29,344,960*l*. This vast amount may be divided, for our present purpose, in the following manner:—The land revenue of the three Presidencies and all their dependent provinces is computed at 16,682,908*l*., or considerably more than half the entire resources of the Indian Empire; the monopoly of the opium growth and trade brings in 4,487,269*l*.; the monopoly of salt manufactured in India, 2,362,308*l*., but of the 2,000,000*l*. derived from the Customs, half must be set

down to the duty on British salt for the protection of the monopoly. Stamps and judicial fees amount to about 750,000*l.*, and the remainder consists of small miscellaneous items. In considering, therefore, the taxation of India, the main question is confined to three sources of revenue — land, salt, and opium; by them alone is the income of the State maintained; without them, it would be annihilated.

Indeed, to simplify still further the discussion, as affects the population of India, we may dismiss the opium monopoly altogether. Opium is grown for export and is sold entirely to the foreign consumer; the foreign consumer in China pays the whole of the monopoly price set on the article by the Anglo-Indian Treasury. The cost and charges do not exceed one-third of the revenue derived from it: the other two-thirds, or three millions sterling, are paid by the Chinese. Whatever may be the injurious results of the trade in opium, financially considered this is one of the most fortunate accidents that ever befel any Government from the habits of a foreign people; though, not being within our own control, it is not to be relied on, and it is the more dangerous, as it places one of the vital conditions of our own power within the grasp of a foreign State. If the cultivation of the poppy be ever legalised and successfully carried on in China, there is an end of the Indian monopoly: and here we say nothing of the strong general considerations, which condemn a traffic, as injurious to our lawful trade with China, as it is indispensable to the finances of India.

The tax on salt, collected partly by the monopoly of production, and partly by import duties, produces upwards of 3,000,000*l.* a-year. The duty is about three farthings a pound, and the Government selling-price at Calcutta one penny a pound; at Benares, two pence a pound. This duty has been reduced 25 per cent. in the last twenty years.

‘The consumption of salt in India has been usually estimated at twelve pounds per head per annum; and assuming the wages of agricultural labour at three rupees per mensem (the ratio now paid on the Calcutta and Bombay railroad and to village watchmen), it would, at Calcutta, absorb the income of five days’ labour to provide the quantity required for a year. The salt duty thus operates as a tax of about one-and-a-half per cent. upon the labourer’s wages, if he have none but himself to provide for. The pressure of the salt-tax on the labourer cannot be regarded as severe, inasmuch as it is *the only way in which he contributes to the pecuniary necessities of the State*; in all other respects he is not necessarily subject to taxation. In Madras and Bombay the duty on salt is only about one-third of that which prevails in Bengal.’ (*Statistical Papers*, p. 48.)

We have quoted these details because, strange as it may appear, with the exception of the Akbarry dues on liquor, and some local dues of inferior value, the salt tax is the only *tax*, properly so called, which is levied on the people of India. It is, of course, obnoxious to the censure which applies to all poll-taxes and monopolies. In a more advanced community a substitute would be found for it; but in India it has the sanction of ancient usage; it is paid by the people without opposition; and, we repeat, it is the only tax that *is*, or, as we shall presently see, that *can be*, levied upon them. Stamps and judicial fees—the only taxes in India which can be said to have an English origin—evidently affect but a small fraction of the population.

The last great item of account is the Land Revenue, which may fairly be termed the basis of the public resources, and the primary element of the Indian Government. Its collection is the great object and business of the State; its payment, and the various conditions of tenure by which it is regulated, are the circumstances which mainly affect the social welfare of the people. In fact, it may almost be said that India, with its enormous territory and its countless population, exists, politically speaking, chiefly for the production of this land revenue, which surpasses in value the whole export trade. No one can under-rate its importance; no one can deny that if the land revenue were not a fundamental institution of India, the fiscal administration of the country would be impossible. Great differences of opinion have at all times prevailed as to the nature of this charge, as to the system on which it ought to be assessed and levied, and as to its true effects on the people and the soil; into these we need not enter: suffice it to say, that neither the fixed settlement, which excludes the Government from the benefit of improvement, and throws the profit into the hands of a middle man; nor the ryotwar tenure, by which the peasant is a mere tenant at will under the Government, appear to us to unite the conditions of a just and wise system. The plan more recently introduced in the North-western Provinces and the Western Ceded Districts consists in an assessment for a limited term of years, generally called the decennial settlement. The land revenue of India presents an imperfect analogy with the rent-charge commutation for tithes in this country; and the same principles which regulate the one are applicable to the other.

Many years have now elapsed since it was shown, as we think, to demonstration in this *Journal*\*, that the land-tax of

---

\* *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1840, vol. lxx. p. 397.

India is no tax at all, but that the revenue collected under that name is derived simply from the appropriation to the State, for public purposes, according to immemorial usage, of a large proportion of the rent of the land. Our present limits forbid us to repeat the arguments on which we rest this opinion: they will be found in the article to which we refer; but we place our assertion under the shelter of the high authority of a witness eminent alike for his knowledge of India and for his acuteness as an economist. Mr. Mill said, before the House of Commons, in 1831:—

‘Nine-tenths, probably, of the revenue of the Government of India is derived from the rent of land, never appropriated to individuals, and always considered to be the property of Government; so that the wants of the State are supplied really and truly without taxation. As far as this goes, the people of the country remain untaxed. In fact, there is no other adequate resource for supplying the wants of the State.’

If this view of the fiscal resources of India be correct, it places them in a very peculiar light, and it accounts for some of these peculiarities. The territorial interest of the Sovereign in the rent of land throughout the country has been acknowledged by the people of India under every variation of dynasty; and acknowledging that interest, they appear to have held that beyond this limit the fiscal claims of the State had no power. In other words, as the landed interest lay with the Sovereign rather than with the people, upon that interest was thrown the whole burden of the public charges. Hence arose the invincible repugnance of the people of India to submit to any other form of direct taxation. On this point all the evidence before us is unanimous.

Mr. Halliday stated before a Parliamentary Committee in 1832—

‘There are no immediate sources of revenue to which you can look, except to the increasing wealth of the country, on which you may lay on by degrees indirect taxes. There is a strong objection on the part of the natives to submit to any new direct taxation.’

And Mr. Bird, well known for the Revenue Settlement of the North-western Provinces, added—

‘If land revenue were reduced or abolished, Government would get no money to pay anybody. I know of nothing upon which an additional revenue can be raised at all to compensate for the loss of the opium revenue.’

An attempt was made on one occasion to establish a house tax in Benares; forthwith 100,000 of the inhabitants quitted their dwellings and their property to encamp in the open country. A similar attempt was made to tax the shops in Bombay;



the tradesmen closed their stalls, and all business was at an end. General Briggs, indeed, does not share this opinion, though he admits that the wealthiest classes of India are practically untaxed; but he informs us that in Mysore no less than eight hundred items of taxation existed under the native government, though the Rajah was bankrupt; and he contends that the *Moturfa*, a tax we have for the most part renounced, was properly an income tax on mercantile profits, levied on whole communities, and distributed amongst themselves by those who paid it, and that this mode of proceeding was expressly sanctioned by the Institutes of Menu (chap. x. v. 120.). If this be the case, justice and policy alike require the adoption of some such expedient; for at present the attempt to raise any material addition to the existing revenue by any new form of direct taxation appears to be considered beyond the reach of the audacity or ingenuity of the Indian Treasury. We are told that the only increase that can be hoped is the slow and gradual increase of improved cultivation, by greater skill and greater capital.

But even from this participation in the agricultural improvement of the country, the Government is debarred by the Permanent Settlement of Lord Cornwallis, extending over 149,782 square miles of the most fertile part of Bengal, with a population of forty million souls. That precipitate and irrevocable measure alienated from the State, under a mistaken impulse of generosity, the resources which were appropriated to its use by the ancient customs of the land — resources which no financial art could ever replace. In fact, from the concession of the Permanent Settlement in 1793, we undertook to govern India with only a portion of the fiscal resources of the country; and such was the levity and ignorance with which the act was completed, that whilst the Zemindars were protected against the ulterior claims of Government, the Ryots were left comparatively unprotected against the exactions of the Zemindars. The cultivators of the soil were exhausted, the revenue thus fell into arrear, and the Zemindars, in their turn, were sold up by the Government.\*

\* In this respect Lord Cornwallis's intentions were defeated. He had declared by Regulation I. 1793, that 'it being the duty of the ruling power to protect all classes of people, and more particularly those who from their situation are the most helpless, the Governor-General in Council would, whenever he may deem it proper, enact such regulations as he may think necessary for the protection and welfare of the dependent Talhookdars, Ryots, and other cultivators of the soil;' and Mr. Harrington declares that the regulations were in no degree designed to abridge the rights and privileges of the cultivators of the soil, or to vest the Zemindars with

A rent-charge on land, and the monopolies of salt and opium, are then, as we have seen, the only important sources of revenue to the Indian Government. It is said, that no other direct tax can be imposed; and the incidence of these indirect taxes is to the last degree incomplete and unsatisfactory.

For it is obvious that whilst the mass of the population of British India contributes in a very slight degree to the necessities of the State, the personal property of the native population contributes nothing at all. Yet this is precisely the description of property to which the British rule has been most favourable. The extortion practised by native rulers on the wealthy classes has ceased,—the law has been justly administered,—investments and mercantile transactions have been rendered more secure,—and the course of trade has thrown an enormous amount of treasure into the country, where it remains. There can be no doubt that the British rule has powerfully increased the capital of India. We know not if it be safe to adopt Mr. Mangles's statement, that the balance of trade has always been in favour of India, and that 150 millions must have been imported into that 'barathrum' of the precious imports in the last century. Against this calculation must be set off the annual bills of the East India Company for about three millions and a half payable in this country. But it is certain that from 1851–56, its less than five millions in gold and 36,500,000 in silver were sent from this country to the Indian ports. The quantity of silver coin and silver ornaments in use in India is astonishing. Mr. Newmarch (from whom we borrow these facts) supposes that the mass of silver may amount to 400 millions sterling, and that the importation, large as it is, may not be more than sufficient to compensate for the loss of one per cent. by abrasion. Very large fortunes have been acquired by native merchants; some of them at Benares are believed to possess four millions sterling; many are able to pay a crore of rupees down: the Parsee community at Bombay enjoys great wealth, and makes a noble use of it; but as far as we can discover, this portion of the property of the natives contributes nothing to the public charges; the land is heavily burdened; the State is struggling with a continual deficit; but the class who are making and have made the greatest progress under our protection escape every form of taxation. We have never seen an attempt to estimate the personal property of the native population; indeed, the secrecy

---

any rights inconsistent with those of their under-tenants; though he admits that they have operated to subject them to arbitrary exactions and distress.

which attends all moveable possessions in the East renders such an estimate impossible. The violence and tyranny of the native courts found means to wring contributions from these wealthy classes; but being well-assured that they have no cause for similar apprehensions now, they contribute little or nothing to the Government to which they owe all their security. The power and the credit which Great Britain enjoys in the world are mainly due to the just incidence of taxation, and to the means by which the industry and wealth of the community are made to contribute in their proper proportions to the public expenses of the nation. Such are the results of those free institutions which identify the interests of the State with the will of the people. In India the relations of the government and the governed rest on no such basis. The supreme power, though absolute in its form, has no such control over the wealth of the country; and in spite of the protection it affords to its subjects, it can obtain from them in return no support but that which it is enabled to extract by a clumsy application of the ancient institutions of the country, and its resources are not adequate to its wants, much less can they anticipate the demands of advancing civilisation.

Let us now proceed to examine summarily the burdens which the revenue of the Indian Government has to bear. They may be divided for our present purpose into four heads: 1. The cost of collection and deductions for divers allowances in India. 2. Interest on debt. 3. Civil and military establishments. 4. Public works and miscellaneous expenses.

1. The cost of collection of the revenue, including the prime cost of salt and opium, and the expense of the Post Office, is estimated for the year ending April, 1857, at 4,887,674*l.*, and to this immediate deduction must be added 1,244,698*l.* for stipulated payments to the Princes of India who are, or were, pensioners of the British Government, and 1,062,954*l.* for allowance to district and village officers and Enamdars, including charitable grants. These payments, which may be termed a dead weight on the budget, amount together to about 7,350,000*l.*

2. The interest on the funded debt of the Company in India, together with the payment of dividends on India stock, and on the home bond debt, is 2,945,464*l.*

3. The civil and military establishments of the Government may be stated thus:—

	£
Civil and political service - - -	2,500,196
Judicial and police - - -	2,633,714

Military charges in India and in England, including military buildings, ration al- lowances, and all that concerns the army	} £	- 12,548,512
Indian navy and retired marine allowances	-	635,000
Stores consigned to India - - -	-	915,822

4. The expenditure on public works, roads, &c. is estimated at 1,216,266*l*.

To these sums must be added about 650,000*l*. for miscellaneous charges, and we arrive at the total estimated expenditure of the year,—at 31,326,022*l*., against receipts to the amount of 29,344,960*l*.; leaving an excess of expenditure over income of 1,981,062*l*.

It is not our intention to analyse these financial statements; we take them as they are presented to Parliament; and we must apologise to our readers for the dry and repulsive aspect of a page of figures. But these facts, which we have endeavoured to compress into the narrowest compass, are absolutely indispensable to a comprehension of the true position and prospects of the Indian Government.

Let us now consider how the future expenditure of the Company is likely to be affected by recent events. We speak not of the immediate cost of the suppression of the Bengal mutiny; however formidable that may be, it is an extraordinary incident to be provided for by extraordinary means. Those means ought, we think, to be found in India; even if it be necessary to levy an extraordinary contribution on what may fairly be termed the conquered territories. The guilt and ruin which have marked every stage of this detestable outbreak are peculiarly the work of the natives themselves. They must bear the burden of the offence. Whilst the munificent generosity of England is cheerfully extended to the relief of our own countrymen and countrywomen who have suffered grievous private losses by the outbreak, we can conceive nothing more unjust or inconsistent with true policy, than that England should be called upon to defray any portion of the public cost of this revolution. One of the first measures taken by the Legislative Council of India was to pass an Act to confiscate the real and personal property of all persons in the late Bengal army who should be convicted of mutiny and desertion, or who should abscond to escape the punishment of their crimes. A very large proportion of the sepoys belong to the landed yeomanry of Oude and the upper provinces of Bengal; and their property justly falls under the grasp of the law. The large pensions of the Delhi Princes and some other pensioners of the Government are forfeited, as

well as the pensions and allowances of the native Bengal army. These acquisitions will afford some compensation to the Treasury for the public losses, and may enable it, when order is restored, to provide for the extraordinary expenses of the year, without any very large addition to the actual charge of the debt. Temporary assistance may, if absolutely required, be afforded by advances from this country, as has been done before; but we repeat, that as we hold it to be a fundamental principle of policy that India must pay the expenses of India, so *à fortiori* must India pay for the unprovoked crimes of the Bengal soldiery; and we are happy to find that a declaration to this effect has been made in Parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is enough that England is ready to sacrifice the blood of her gallant troops to restore tranquillity to a misguided people, and to vindicate the authority of the empire.

It appears from the accounts we have just past in review, that upwards of thirteen millions sterling are expended on the military and naval services of India; two millions and a half on the civil and political establishments; and about the same sum on the administration of justice and the police. These expenses, and the allowances on public works, are those over which the Government has control; the remainder are beyond its power. These leading financial items correspond, then, to the three great divisions of the administration,—the expense of defence, the expense of the civil service, the expense of justice; and the future government of India rests on these three cardinal points. To all of them one general remark applies. Our readers have not, we trust, accompanied us thus far, without perceiving the cause which we hold to be mainly accountable for the shortcomings of the Indian Government. Throughout every branch of the public service, the amount of European control has been considerably below what was required; but the services of Europeans were costly and scarce; the Company had not the financial means of increasing them. Hence the regiments of the Indian army have been commanded by twenty-four European officers, whilst those of the Queen, serving in India, had forty-eight; and of this inadequate number, some were absent on furlough, some were sick, some were employed on the staff, and some were promoted to civil and political duties, because the civil service was even weaker than the army. Notwithstanding the enormous extension of territory, and the difficulty of governing territories newly acquired, no adequate addition has been made to the European forces, to the European officers of native regiments, or to the European civilians. Some 24,000 English soldiers, the reduced complements of European officers, and

about 750 civil servants, have continued to govern 130,000,000 of people. The consequence was, that the greater portion of our strength was thrown into some of the new districts. The Punjaub and the Sikh States, for instance, were under efficient control; they were firmly administered; and they have stood the ordeal of this explosion. The danger has been greatest where long experience and extreme confidence had disarmed us and allowed us to rely too much on native agency. That the European establishments of India were far too small, has long been perfectly well known to every one who has taken part in the government of that country. Each successive Governor-general has urged an augmentation of them; and if the Directors of the East India Company had consulted their personal interests, they would have consented to extend their own patronage, and to make new appointments. But they resisted these applications, because they knew that the revenues of India did not enable them to increase the numbers of their servants; and they were encouraged in this course by an honourable and liberal policy, which led men to advocate the admission of natives to a larger share in the government, with a view not only to economy, but to the conciliation and amelioration of the natives themselves. It is perfectly true, as Sir John Malcolm said, that 'to obtain the confidence and allegiance of our subjects, we must associate ourselves with them; and that as we could never have conquered India without the assistance of the natives, so by them alone can we preserve it.' But all experience has shown, that though native agency is our great instrument of power and government with constant and vigilant European control, it becomes our most dangerous antagonist without it. The gross inefficiency of the police of India, and the revolting instances of torture which have been proved against many of the inferior collectors of revenue and police officers; in short, the petty tyranny and corruption of the natives when placed by us in authority over each other, arise entirely from the absence of sufficient European control. One of Malcolm's secrets of success, and no man had more influence over the population, was to 'have no native (whatever be his character) as a general medium with those with whom you have business.' But this personal control is obviously impossible as long as we have on an average one civilian to 200,000 souls, and to 200 square miles of territory.

The first consideration that strikes us on a survey of these charges, is the enormous amount of the military expenditure. The aggregate strength of the army in India, from 1851 to 1857, was about 290,000 men. In the former year, the Queen's

forces comprised twenty-four regiments of infantry, and five of dragoons, amounting in all to 29,480 men, which is the largest European force we ever had in India until the present time. The Company's European infantry consists of six regiments, the strength of which is 6266 men. The regular native army amounted, in 1851, to 157,711 men; and the irregular infantry to 39,613 men; the regular native cavalry, 10,186; the irregular 21,134. The artillery, with sappers and miners, to 19,000, partly European and partly native. In round numbers, the whole native force may be stated at 247,000, commanded by 5142 European officers on the Company's establishment. In 1835, the army was reduced as low as 183,000 men, and the military expenses in India to about seven millions: but the war in Afghanistan from 1839 to 1842 led to a large increase; six Queen's regiments were sent out, and the strength of those in India was raised; these events were followed by the rupture with Gwalior, the operations in Scinde, and the Sikh wars. During the Crimean campaign the Queen's forces in India were reduced by two regiments, and the last returns we have, give the strength of the army at 26,826 Queen's troops; 14,649 Company's European troops; 240,465 Company's native troops; and 31,000 native contingents. The police force militarily organised under European officers, consisted of 24,000 natives with 35 European officers.

Whatever hope may previously have been entertained, that we should gradually be enabled to reduce our Indian military establishments by the extinction of our internal enemies, by the subjugation or pacific disposition of our neighbours, and by the progress of civil government, these expectations have now made way for very different conclusions. Nobody doubts, after the events we have witnessed, that the very existence of our power in the East depends on the maintenance of a powerful army, and that the European element in that army must be augmented. The dangers against which we have to protect ourselves may be classed under three heads: the disaffection of our own subjects; the hostility of Foreign States; the latent enmity of native Indian States.

Although the British army is scattered over an immense territory, and has to control 140 millions of men, in the proportion of one European to 3500 natives, it cannot be said that the mass of the population of Hindostan inspires us with the least apprehension. They have shown no disposition to rise; and they are utterly powerless if they did rise. Our enemies have been solely and exclusively the men to whom we ourselves have given arms, and taught the art of using them; though even our own

sepoys, led by themselves, proved utterly unable to maintain themselves against a body of resolute Englishmen however small. But the whole population of our Eastern dominions is not equally pacific. In the Punjaub it was found expedient to disarm the country. Less than thirty years have elapsed since Central and Southern India were harried by the Pindharees and martial tribes of the north, ever ready for plunder. Lastly, throughout India, there are large numbers of men of martial habits, who have been partly absorbed in the British and native armies, but who would become formidable if no such service was open to them. In the newly conquered or annexed provinces, the Punjaub, Pegu, Oude, and the southern Mahratta district, a large force of occupation is absolutely requisite; and here we would observe, that although in this contest the conduct of the Sikhs and Ghoorkas has been admirable, and they adhered to our colours whilst they gratified their own martial ardour and their hatred of the Hindostanee races, yet all experience in the East shows, that our best friends of one day may be our worst enemies the next, and that the security of our dominion requires that we be able to face the disaffection of the natives, in whatever quarter it may break out.

The foreign wars in which our Eastern forces may be engaged do not fall within the scope of this inquiry. Our frontier is secure, our relations with neighbouring powers are apparently peaceful, but a storm may at any time arise; within the past year we have been engaged in hostility with China and with Persia; and if an impression should prevail in Eastern courts that the internal authority of the British Government is at all weakened in India, that opinion, however erroneous, may lead to infractions of treaty we should be obliged to punish.

But if no other cause existed for the maintenance of a large British army in India, it would be found in the attitude and resources of the independent native states. It is a common opinion on the continent of Europe, and perhaps even in this country, that the East India Company has extinguished and annihilated all the native rulers of India; that it is the sole mistress of the soil, and the sole government capable of bringing armies into the field. It is true that the British power in India is incalculably greater than that of any native court, and that all the native courts are bound to us by treaties which restrain them from making war on us or on one another; but the actual importance of these states must not be overlooked. There still exists in India at least 220 sovereign princes, rajahs, or chieftains, of different ranks and power—from the Nizam, who is the monarch of a great kingdom, with a distinct army of 60,000



men, down to the petty Mahratta and Rajpoot chiefs. These princes rule and govern upwards of 600,000 square miles of territory; they have at least forty millions of subjects, their independent revenues are extremely great, and they have under their direct orders military bodies, wholly unconnected with the Company, which amount to 350,000 armed men. It is true, says Mr. Thornton, from whose papers we borrow these details, that considerable portions of these troops of native states are better fitted for police purposes than for war; that no regular system of payment obtains among them; and that they are for the most part badly organised and inefficient. But, on the other hand, the list is by no means complete. It comprises the rajahs who may be said to have a political *status*; but most of these have in turn petty dependent feudatories, all having armed followers, which swell the native forces of India to a prodigious amount. The command of a body of troops is to the nobles of India an essential mark of dignity. They cling to it with the utmost tenacity; even though they know that their military power could not resist for a moment the strength of the Supreme Government, and that they are forbidden to wage war on their neighbours. Hence a very large proportion of the revenues of the native princes of India is consumed in the maintenance of these armed bands, who considerably outnumber the whole British force. The Nizam, for example, is in continual difficulties to raise money and even to pay his soldiers; he has been compelled to cede territory to his creditors; yet nothing would induce him to disband a body of Arab mercenaries who were and are the terror of the country. Nana Sahib, the infamous Rajah of Bhittoor, was too inconsiderable a personage to figure among the native princes, having no territory of his own; yet the events of Cawnpore show that there is hardly a noble in India who cannot bring guns and armed followers into the field.

This is obviously one of the greatest perils we have to provide against. The native princes are jealous of our influence; they detest the foreign arm which restrains their power and lowers their dignity; they dread to see their territory fall under the grasp of the Company, if they should violate the conditions of their independence, as regulated by treaty. But they reluctantly submit to the certainty of our power. Nothing is more remarkable in the history of the late outbreak, than the resolute determination of the territorial rajahs *not* to embark in it. They felt every one of them that they had given hostages to England, and that to betray hostility was to risk annihilation. Hence not one ruler of any independent or protected state

rose against us. The Nizam, supported by his able Minister Salar Jung, was thoroughly staunch, and his attitude preserved the peace of Southern India. Scindiah and Holkar remained firm, though their troops revolted and threatened to depose them. Indeed, it is worthy of remark that wherever the native powers had in their service *men of the same class* as our Bengal sepoys, these men revolted, even from their native masters, and broke away to join the forces of the insurrection at Delhi. The Rajpoot princes remained faithful, though inactive, and seemed chiefly anxious to avoid exposing their own troops to the infection of mutiny. The Sikh protected states exerted themselves vigorously in our support, and especially the Rajah of Puttiala deserves the gratitude of the British people for his zeal in protecting the fugitives who reached his territory, and in assisting the British Commissioner at Umballah.

Whatever may be thought of the vices of native government, and whatever motives may have been held to justify the annexation of native territories to rescue them from the horrors of such misrule as that of Oude, the princes of India have, by their conduct in this great emergency, established a strong claim on the British Government for the maintenance of their independent authority. Their prudence or their good faith has restrained them from every act of hostility. Not a treaty has been broken, not an attempt made by any responsible native government, to crush the sick lion. Had they brought their forces into the field against us, during the months of June, July, and August, the conflagration must have spread over the whole peninsula; the Europeans might have been swept from the country; and before reinforcements could arrive, we should have been reduced within the ramparts of Fort William and Fort St. George. The native princes of India judged wisely, for they would have plunged their country into a sea of bloodshed and desolation, without any definite hope of reconstituting a native authority. But we hold it to be not the less incumbent on us to recognise and reward their fidelity; and not to expose them, a second time, to the same temptation.

That a more efficient army must be maintained in India admits, then, of no doubt; and as a complete reform of the Bengal military establishment is forced upon us by the total extinction of the army of that presidency, we are at liberty to inquire, in what manner the military resources of India can best be applied. The cry is, of course, for more European troops; and no doubt a permanent augmentation of the European force, serving in India, must be decided on. But a European corps costs

at least twice as much as a native one.\* Europeans serving in India annually lose ten per cent. by death, invaliding, and other causes; while natives lose only one and a half per cent.; and though the British soldier is a matchless combatant in the field, he is obviously unfitted, by climate and ignorance of the country, for many of the duties which have hitherto been discharged by the native army. We are, therefore, at once met by the difficulty, that the changes required will throw an additional burden on the financial resources of India, which are already overtaxed, and that no amount of European troops could perform all the duties required of them. The native army of India is the only institution which we had implanted in the habits of the people, and which associated them with British authority. Unhappily, from causes which are still obscure, the confidence we placed in this institution has been cruelly shaken; but we must take care lest we fall into the opposite error. No man who knows India can suppose that our power is to be maintained there without a native army, even if we had the means, which we have not, of maintaining 100,000 British soldiers there. It was a remark of Sir John Malcolm, that 'in the event of our undervaluing our native army, the natives of India would lose the opinion they entertain of their consequence to the English Government; and the whole tone of the army would be lowered in a degree far exceeding what we could gain by a few European regiments.' 'What I dread,' said Lord Ellenborough, on another occasion, 'is an increasing want of consideration for the natives on the part of those entrusted with the civil government of the country, and yet more, an increasing want of consideration for the native soldiers on the part of British officers.' No inconsiderable portion of the native armies have happily remained unshaken, and they deserve to be rewarded, as much as the traitors deserve to be punished.

We suggested in a recent article, that the sepoys of the Bengal army had been diverted from their allegiance by secret

---

\* The following statement of the comparative cost of each arm of the service in India was produced by Mr. Melvill in 1854:—

	£
Her Majesty's Dragoons (8 troops, 701 sabres) - - -	79,680
Native Cavalry (6 troops, 500 sabres) - - -	34,840
Native Irregular Cavalry (6 Ressalahs, 584 sabres) - -	18,770
Her Majesty's Infantry (9 companies, 1068 bayonets) -	61,120
E. I. C. European Infantry (10 companies, 970 bayonets) -	52,380
Native Infantry (10 companies, 1160 men) - - -	25,670
Brigade of Horse Artillery (mixed, European and native) -	59,310
Battalion of Foot Artillery - - - - -	31,020

societies. Nor have we far to look for a body, which has all the wonted characteristics of these associations. The Brahmins of Northern India form a society, armed with all the arrogance of caste, the fanaticism of superstition, and the physical power of soldiers. They are the descendants of those warrior-priests who were the real masters of India before the Mohamedan conquest. Even amongst the Hindoos, the Brahmins of Oude and the adjacent districts are dreaded for their accursed knowledge of the most ferocious and unholy practices of their religion—votaries of Kali and Bhowance—men who ally their superstition to their crimes. No more formidable confederacy ever existed in the world. Yet these were the men among whom the Bengal army was recruited, or rather recruited itself, for the recruiting officers were the native subahdars and havildars, who clung to their connexions, and allowed no soldiers of inferior caste to enter its ranks; and its English officers seem to have participated in these fatal prejudices. Hence this pernicious element, fatal to military discipline, was continually gaining strength in the regiments it had once infected. Nor is this only the case in Bengal. In the Madras army, and especially the Madras cavalry, the Mohamedan descendants of the soldiery of Hyder Ali and Tippoo still retain almost as exclusive an ascendancy as the ‘Poorbea’ Brahmins of Bengal, and are as little to be trusted. The mine has now exploded; we know who are the real enemies of our power and our civilisation—the Mohamedans and the Brahmins we cherished in our armies. Happily, the violence of the shock has blown to atoms those who laid and fired the train. The Bengal army has ceased to exist, and we trust that, as such, no attempt will ever be made to reconstruct it. Hence the expenditure lavished upon about three-fifths of the native army may be turned to other and more useful purposes; seventy-four regiments of infantry and ten of cavalry are expunged from the army list, and this reduction may be computed at about two millions.

Upon the fall of Delhi, and the dispersion of that focus of rebellion, it followed, as an inevitable consequence, that the seat of war and the remaining strength of the mutineers were transported to Oude. We pause for a moment to point out the striking connexion of this province with the whole of this memorable convulsion. Not, indeed, that we attribute the outbreak to the machinations of the Oude Princes, or that we suppose the annexation of Oude to have provoked a rebellion. On the contrary, the justification of that act is, in our judgment, strengthened by these events. But Oude was the only province situated in the heart of Bengal which had retained the lawless

rule and the ferocious habits once so common throughout India. The court of Lucknow, far more than the court of Delhi, was a living representative of Mohamedan power, and a centre of Mohamedan influence. Amongst those profligate nobles and in that shameful capital, the English Resident was hated even more than he was feared, for his presence was a check on their fanaticism and a constant reproach to their crimes. But though the court and one-fifth of the inhabitants were Mohamedans, the people of Oude are also the proudest and most exclusive guardians of the Hindoo traditions. The country still retains some vestiges of the ancient dynasties which made it the seat of their power; and in the recesses of the Brahminical temples of Ayodhya, the most impenetrable mysteries of the faith are still preserved. No other district contiguous to our own possessions had retained a class of men so strange to civilisation and so repugnant to authority; in no other part of India have the landowners and the peasantry taken so fierce and active a part in the rebellion. Yet, by the strangest of contradictions, it was from this very population that we drew two-thirds of the Bengal army; and when the territory had fallen into our own hands, the troops with which we occupied it were themselves the ~~near~~ kinsmen of the men whose lawlessness they were ordered to put down. This cause mainly contributed to render the Bengal army so undisciplined,—a cause which demonstrates more powerfully than anything we can say, the necessity of extinguishing that centre of fanatical disaffection in the heart of the Indian Empire. But to return from this digression.

The Bombay army and the Madras infantry have shown, with few exceptions, that the principles on which the native troops have been organised and recruited in those presidencies are sound. They have resisted great temptations in a great emergency, and they are free from those pretensions which have proved so fatal to the discipline and fidelity of the army of Bengal. Above all, they may teach us to discriminate between the native populations of India, which present as many varieties as those of Europe. The distinction hitherto made between the armies of the minor presidencies is invidious, and had better be effaced. They deserve to become the undivided native army of India, and to their present strength we believe that thirty new regiments may with ease and safety be added, to be recruited in Southern and Western India, with some admixture of Ghoorka battalions from the North. The Irregular Cavalry, as it is improperly termed, for it is as regular as any other part of the army, has become one of the finest corps we possess; and it is a service for which the martial population of the Punjaub and the Cis-

Sutlej States is peculiarly adapted. A larger force of this arm might easily be raised, to be cantoned with European troops. The Artillery must be considerably augmented, and ought to be entirely European; and it would be desirable to raise some additional European regiments for permanent service in India, who might be commanded by the officers of the late Bengal army. Indeed the Company are now raising four regiments of Light Dragoons in this country. But these arrangements do not relieve this country from the necessity of raising the Queen's forces in India to nearly double their previous amount. The necessary complement of European troops is estimated by a highly competent authority at not less than 41 battalions of Infantry, 25 to be stationed in Bengal, 7 in Madras, 6 in Bombay, and 3 in Pegu; and 9 Cavalry regiments, 5 for Bengal, and 2 for each of the other Presidencies. Such a measure may be necessary, but it is one of extreme gravity, for it will materially affect our own military institutions; it will modify the character of the English army; it will prove a considerable permanent drain on the English population\*; it will materially increase the charge of the military establishments of India; and should we hereafter be engaged in war abroad, or compelled to provide for our defence at home, it may materially weaken the actual power of this country. Our limits forbid us to pursue these complex and momentous topics to their ulterior consequences; but they will not escape the full consideration of British statesmen and of the British Parliament. We shall only add, that highly as we value the maintenance of our authority in India, we must not measure its importance by the interests of the people of that country rather than by our own; and it would be unjust and unsafe to call upon the people of England to make vast permanent sacrifices to impose a military yoke on any foreign country, from which no direct political advantage can ever be derived by us.

The same remarks apply with equal force to the participation of educated natives in the civil and judicial branches of the public service, to which they have been admitted with increasing success in the last twenty years. A violent blow has been given to the confidence we felt in the native character, and advantage has been taken of the crisis to decry the liberal and civilising policy which had been extended to the upper classes of our subjects. One of the great difficulties of the Indian

---

\* To maintain in India a British army of 50,000 men, the country must be prepared to raise and send out about 15,000 men per annum, to supply the loss of life and provide the necessary reliefs.

government for the next few years will be found in the bitter scorn and hatred which the rebellion has engendered amongst the Europeans in India against the natives. The language of our countrymen at Calcutta is as revolting as it is sanguinary and impolitic. This outbreak bears the stamp of ferocious ignorance and brutal violence, not of political conspiracy. It put arms into the hands of Brahmin sepoys, and it has appealed to the bigotry and the passions of the native community. But it has found no leader, and we question whether it has found sympathy among any part of the population whom a more liberal education had already reached. 'Our enemy is the barbarism of India, not its dawning intelligence.

'What are the real circumstances that have caused this rebellion?' said Baboo Duckinarunjun Mookerjee, a Hindoo gentleman, addressing a public meeting at Calcutta the other day:

'Speaking as I am from the place which is the centre of the scenes of those mutinies, and possessing as we do the advantages of being identified in race, language, manners, customs and religion with the majority of those misguided wretches who have taken a part in this rebellion, and thereby disgraced their manhood by drawing their arms against the very dynasty whose salt they have eaten, to whose paternal rule they and their ancestors have for the last hundred years owed the security of their lives and properties, and which is the best ruling power that we had the good fortune to have within the last ten centuries, and addressing as I am a Society the individual members of which are fully familiar with the thoughts and sentiments of their countrymen, and who represent the feelings and interests of the great bulk of Her Majesty's native subjects, I but give utterance to a fact patent to us all, that the Government have done nothing to interfere with our religion, and thereby to afford argument to its enemies to weaken their allegiance.

'When discussing an Indian subject, it should always be remembered that this country is not inhabited by savages and barbarians, but by those whose language and literature are the oldest in the world, and whose progenitors were engaged in the contemplation of the sublimest doctrines of religion and philosophy at a time when their Anglo-Saxon and Gallic contemporaries were deeply immersed in darkness and ignorance; and if, owing to 900 years of Mahomedan tyranny and misrule, this great nation has sunk in sloth and lethargy, it has, thank God, not lost its reason, and is able to make a difference between the followers of a religion which inculcates the doctrine that should be propagated at the point of the sword, and that which offers compulsion to none, but simply invites inquiry.'

Whether it be the will of Providence that India be lost or regained — that our empire be dismembered or consolidated — it is upon the progress of civilisation that we stake this great

issue. Our steps have been slow — we may not have done enough — we may have seemed to distrust the growing power even of that light, ‘which is come into the world and the world ‘knew it not’ — but we are not the less certain that the only principle, on which the government of India can be carried on worthily of this country, is that of planting amongst her pagan millions the seed of a nobler faith and of a better life. Nor, in a strictly political point of view, is this principle less essential to our success. We have seen how inadequately the ponderous and uncouth machinery of native finance can meet the demands of a progressive age. We have seen how an army which preserved in its lines the mystic oppression of a Brahminical priesthood, turned against the government it had sworn to serve. The system formed by the early servants of the East India Company, on the basis which they found in the twenty-four Pergunnahs, has broken down. Let us hope that India has outgrown it; and that this convulsion marks an era of promise for the future, as well as of condemnation for the past. In an enlarged view of this subject, the lesson and the remedy consist not in contracting our efforts, or lowering the claims of civilisation, but in redoubling them. The risk may be considerable. But if it be impossible to hold India by military force alone, except by sacrifices which the people of this country ought not to make, and which could never be repaid to them by that dependency, then it is evident that the future government of India depends on a more active development of her material resources, a more vigorous cultivation of that native intelligence which is not arrayed against us, and a larger infusion of European enterprise.

We say that the risk of this policy is considerable; but whatever be its results, it is the only policy this country can pursue. Many eminent statesmen have denied that the progress of education among the natives of India would attach them more firmly to the authority of this country. But, in fact, every thing depends on the nature of the education to be imparted to them. We may cultivate the intelligence of the natives, but so long as they retain the moral and social elements of the Asiatic character, it is perhaps a generous delusion to imagine that any true reliance can be placed upon them. One of the most accomplished Mohamedans of India — a man of highly cultivated mind and elegant manners — comes to England, spends two years here, talks our language like a native, mixes in the best society, becomes domesticated in English families; and the next time we hear of this individual it is as the principal agent of Nena



Subsequent experience has shown that, as Lord William Bentinck anticipated, the difficulty is not to exclude Europeans from India, but to induce them to go there. No attraction can draw the labouring classes to a burning climate, where handiwork is paid at threepence a day. The trader is merely a temporary resident at the outports; and the Europeans concerned in indigo-planting, or in railroads, are generally mere overseers, employed by the great houses, or companies. The whole number of European residents in India not being in the service of the Queen or the Company, both male and female, was stated in 1852 to be about 10,000. The number was believed not to have increased in the last twenty years; and the British-born subjects not in the service of the Company, residing in the interior as indigo and sugar planters, landed proprietors, or cotton agents, were believed not to exceed 317 in the three Presidencies.\* The independent European community in India is, moreover, extremely dissatisfied with its position; bitterly hostile to the Government; imperious to the natives; indignant at the idea of submitting to the law administered by native agency; and eager to exercise all the rights of Englishmen, amongst a community which they regard as only fit for slavery. These evils arise in part from the too great exclusion of these persons from the exercise of authority; and we have no doubt, if they had more social and public duties to perform, we should hear less of their complaints. One of the objects of the Government should be to utilise, as far as possible, all the European talent and energy which exists in India, by removing the barriers which have converted the civil service, especially in Bengal, into a caste scarcely less exclusive than the Brahmins themselves. The greatest internal defect in the Indian administration is, that it has incurred the unpopularity of a bureaucratic oligarchy.

The number of Europeans who have purchased lands in India is extremely small, partly because the climate does not permit us to make India the permanent abode of our families; and experience shows that India is more fatal to the English race than any of the colonies. But there are already some English zemindars, and we learn with great satisfaction that even during the insurrection, and in the heart of the disturbed provinces, as, for example, at Allyghur, they have been unmolested. One of the most serious obstacles to the settlement of Europeans in India, has hitherto been the state of the law and the inefficiency of the police. The attempt to place

---

\* Appendix to Report on Indian Territories, 1852, p. 339.

Englishmen under the jurisdiction of the Mofussil Courts was indignantly resented, and they conceive, not altogether without reason, that the existing administration of justice in India does not afford adequate protection to their rights. This great subject has recently been fully considered by the Indian Law Commission, and a measure, produced by the joint labours of several of the most eminent and experienced lawyers of England and of India, has been for many months in the hands of the Executive Government. We trust that one of the first steps to be taken after the present storm has subsided, and when the civil power resumes its authority, will be the promulgation of this reform of the judicial and legal system of India. Such a measure would form a natural part of the changes resulting from this convulsion; it would at once assert and establish the authority of the British Crown on a broader basis; and it would powerfully conduce to remove some of the objections to the settlement of Europeans in the country. The police establishments are admitted to be very unsatisfactory, and were about to undergo a thorough reorganisation at the very time the mutiny broke out. A native police, militarily organised under European officers, would serve to perform many of the duties hitherto discharged by the native army, and it would be exposed to little or no risk of taking part in an insurrection.

Of all the causes which may extend European influence in India, the most powerful appears to be the great public works now in progress or in preparation. They are carried on with European capital; they demand European skill and superintendence; and their results cannot fail to extend the interest of Europeans in the interior of the country. We believe that in no part of the world is there such a field for the advantageous employment of skill and capital as on the public works of India. Labour is cheap and inexhaustible; the climate is tropical; the soil is capable of every species of culture; and experience has already surpassed the anticipated results. One of the first of these undertakings was the work conducted by Colonel Arthur Cotton on the Godavery, which is now almost completed, and will irrigate 1,200,000 acres of land formerly unproductive. The expenditure on this 'anicut,' or bar, has been 188,000*l.*, and the increase of revenue in eight years only was 360,000*l.*, whilst the exports of the district increased sixfold in the same period. Similar works have been undertaken on the Cauvery and the Kistnah, and are described with great ability in Colonel Baird Smith's most interesting work on the irrigation of Southern India. Of Lord Dalhousie's administration two monuments will remain amongst the greatest

benefits conferred upon India—the Ganges Canal, extending over 525 miles in length, and measuring 170 feet at its extreme breadth—a work of such extraordinary magnitude, that it is five-fold greater than all the main lines of Lombardy and Egypt together; equal to the aggregate length of the four greatest canals in France; exceeding all the first-class canals of Holland; and greater by one-third than the greatest navigative canal in America. \*The cost of this great canal was 1,400,000*l.*; it will restore to fertility 1,470,000 acres, and it will rescue millions from death by the periodical famines of India. Lord Dalhousie also witnessed the completion of the Great Trunk Road from Calcutta to Delhi (887 miles), which will shortly be continued to Peshawur.

But in a political and military, if not in a commercial, point of view, even these works are of secondary interest to the great lines of railway; and in Major Kennedy's able 'Memorandum 'on Indian Railways,' he mainly rested his advocacy of these schemes, not on the conveyance of goods and passengers, not on the advantage to agriculture and trade, but, above all, on the enormously increased facility which the North-western Railway of India will give to the operations of the Bengal army. The experience of the last few months has brought home to every mind the paramount importance of being able to move and concentrate troops with rapidity between Calcutta or Kurrachee and the north-western military stations. Rapidity and safety of transport, for men, for treasure, and for stores, will relieve the army from the fatigues which are most trying to its health and efficiency in the climate of India. Major Kennedy calculates the actual gain in expenditure at one quarter of the Bengal military estimates, or about 1,250,000*l.*; because a force of two-thirds the numerical amount conveyed by railroad would be more efficient than the present army brought together by slow and exhausting marches. Railroads are precisely one of those weapons of civilisation which will enable us to wield a greater power with a diminished numerical force. From a memorandum laid before Parliament on the 22nd July last, we learn that 3,628 miles of railway have been sanctioned in India, and are in course of construction; the estimated outlay is thirty millions sterling; the amount of capital already issued with the guarantee of the Company is 20,314,300*l.*

Nor can we refrain from adding, that there is another class of works, unproductive, indeed, in a pecuniary sense, but of essential consequence to the maintenance of authority in a conquered country—we mean fortifications. It is singularly characteristic of the reckless confidence of the English character that we have

not in all India any modern fortress of real strength; that even our military stations were unprotected by works; and that at Delhi, where some few lacs had been spent on the walls, we left the place without a European garrison. A single fort commanding the city might have crushed the revolt, as has subsequently been shown by the battery hastily thrown up on the heights near Benares. The occupation of the country imperatively requires that our arsenals and magazines should be small citadels, built outside the large towns, but so as to command them, and garrisoned by a majority of European troops.

Our future tenure of India may, and we trust will, be consolidated by the overthrow of this great revolt; but its permanent stability depends on the possibility of a well-appointed occupation of the country by civil enterprise and by military power, in place of the semi-Asiatic administration which has hitherto prevailed under the name of British rule.

The Speech delivered from the Throne on the opening of the present session of Parliament recommended, in guarded language, the affairs of the 'East Indian' dominions of this country to the serious consideration and earnest attention of Parliament. We do not pretend to interpret the exact meaning attached by the Government to these expressions, and for obvious reasons no explanation of them could be given by the Ministers of the Crown in the brief period of the session which elapsed before Christmas. But the attention of Parliament, thus authoritatively invoked, cannot fail to be directed to the system of government under which India has been ruled for the last seventy years; and if we are interested in the first place in ascertaining the true causes of the late frightful convulsion, our next duty is to consider what changes in the administration of our Eastern Empire are required to heal the wounds and to avert the recurrence of this great calamity. It would be unjust to accuse the Government of India of having provoked the rebellion, for even in the ranks of its fiercest enemies no tangible grievance, no positive act of misrule, has been alleged against it. The cry which roused the Bengal army to revolt was a fiction, not a reality; and to that cry the people of India did not respond. Nevertheless it is a weighty accusation against those who have so long exercised an absolute control over the resources of India, and whose servants knew all that could be known by Europeans of the state of the country, that they failed to foresee and to provide against this intense and widespread disaffection; and the people of England are entitled to hold the men to whom they had delegated the administration of India responsible for the result. Hence the retention of that power

which is still vested in the East India Company becomes questionable; for that body has forfeited the confidence it derived from success, and without the energetic intervention of the Imperial Government and the forces of the Crown, India must have been lost altogether. An officer who loses or places in jeopardy, by whatever cause, a vessel of the State entrusted to his command stands arraigned before a court of his brother officers. The East India Company stands on its trial before Parliament and the country, whether the late disaster has been caused by any fault of its own, or by events beyond its control.

We do not attempt to prejudge the result of this great inquiry; and whilst we think the inquiry itself is just and inevitable, we deprecate any hasty conclusions on the subject; for if the time be arrived when the course of events and the wisdom of Parliament decree the extinction of the East India Company, a far harder task remains in substituting another and more efficient mode of administration for that which it may be proposed to abolish.

The policy of the East India Company in the government of this great dependency, has been above all things cautious, forbearing, and temperate. It has sometimes been deficient in promptitude and vigour; it has delayed to execute measures evidently conducive to the welfare of the country\*; it has beheld the exploits of its adventurous lieutenants, and the triumphs of its victorious statesmen, with more alarm than satisfaction; and in the true spirit of a trading corporation, the obstructive power of ancient Toryism lingered in Leadenhall Street for nearly a quarter of a century after free discussion and public liberty had disarmed the monster at Whitehall. Nothing is easier than to expose the anomalies and imperfections of such a government, — the election of the rulers of India by some 1780 owners of stock, of whom 400 are women, — the retention of a joint-stock interest on the territorial revenues of India when all commercial operations had ceased, — the relations of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control, — and half a dozen similar peculiarities. But admitting all these self-evident propositions, we think there is some danger that the incontestable services and merits of the Company may at this time be overlooked, and that more importance may be assigned to the mere form of the Home Government of India than it deserves.

The double government of the East India Company and of the Board of Control has effectually answered the first great

---

\* Thus the Grand Trunk Road was projected in 1796, begun to be executed in 1836, and finished in 1856.

object for which it was designed; it has saved the administration of India from the fluctuation of parties at home, and it has saved this country from the burdens — sometimes not inconsiderable burdens — of Indian deficits. The wars of conquest, the strokes of political aggrandisement, undertaken or achieved in its name, have been more frequently reprobated than rewarded at the India House, and it was in a mid career of victory that Lord Wellesley was censured and Lord Ellenborough recalled. The illustrious historian, who afterwards became their servant, but never their flatterer, has left on record his deliberate judgment that although it had been his lot to blame the Company's Government more often than to praise it, yet he believed that no government ever showed more good will to their subjects, or less attachment to mischievous powers lodged in their own hands. If we contrast their administration with the fervid invectives of Mr. Burke, or with those writers of our own day who imitate his violence, but without his eloquence or his wisdom, the Company seems a marvel of disinterestedness and intelligence; if, on the other hand, we contrast it with some imaginary standard of perfection, the Company falls very far short of it.

It is not uncommon to hear the government of this country denounced for its aristocratic character, its family and party predilections, and what are called the abuses of the governing class. To that class the Directors of the East India Company never belonged; they are the purest expression of the mercantile society of this country, and accordingly their patronage has been bestowed and their administration recruited amongst that honourable and industrious portion of the community. Yet with the usual injustice of mankind, the same persons who denounce the ministers of the Crown as aristocrats will sneer at the ministers of the India House as shopkeepers. When will men learn that the merits or the defects of government arise not so much from the good or bad qualities of this or that class in society, as from the strength and the weaknesses of human nature?

That the machinery of administrative power and official correspondence between the India House, the India Board, and the Indian Government is cumbrous and inconvenient, no one can for a moment dispute. Nor can it be doubted that it would be of the utmost advantage to the English Minister who transacts the business of India in Parliament and in the Cabinet to have the utmost facility of access with the experienced public servants who now act in the name of the Company. The department of the affairs of India in this country ought to be *one*, acting under the same roof, and governed by the same spirit.

But we do not believe that these defects in the present constitution of the Indian offices have had any very serious practical results upon the policy of this country towards India, or upon the conduct of the executive government in India; nor therefore that a change in the style and title of the government of India would necessarily bring about the important changes which are sometimes supposed to be connected with it. It is probably true that the natives of India, accustomed to regard with peculiar veneration the attributes of monarchy, would pay a more loyal allegiance to Queen Victoria than to a merchant company, which they conceive to have farmed the revenues of their country. The Crown of England and the imperial standard are emblems which have a meaning throughout the world: they have behind them an immortal history; they rally round them the freest people and the widest colonial empire on the globe. We have no doubt that the announcement of the assumption of the Government by Her Majesty, proclaimed throughout India in the most solemn form, would be hailed with enthusiasm by the great majority of the people, and would be an appropriate answer to the late attempt to wrest the sceptre from our hands. The fusion, or at least the equalisation in rank, of the faithful remnant of the Indian army and the Queen's forces, would be a proper acknowledgment of the heroic gallantry displayed in the late emergency; and it would have the advantage of effacing the past and giving a lofty promise to the future. We do not underrate these external acts of policy or favour, and we think they deserve the consideration of the Government: but we cannot forget that they are external, and that they do not necessarily solve or materially assist the problem before us. Little or nothing could be done in India by the Crown, which the Company cannot undertake; little or nothing has been omitted by the Company, which can be supplied by the Crown; for as we all know in this country, their identity for all practical political objects is complete, and the change would be greater in appearance than in reality.

To what principle can we have recourse more sound and reasonable, than that the Minister for the affairs of India—himself, a member of the British Cabinet accountable to Parliament for his acts—should be assisted by a council or body of men, selected for their experience in the civil, judicial, and military services of India, and as far as possible independent of the vicissitudes of party government? Such is, or ought to be, the present Court of Directors; and if that body be suppressed, the majority of the men who now compose it are precisely those whom the Government would find it necessary to employ under

another name. The time is altogether past when the Company can be said to have any interests of its own distinct from those of India and of England. It has no trading monopoly to defend ; it has no property of its own except a fixed charge on the territorial revenues of India, and an accumulating fund in this country ; neither collectively nor individually, have its members any profit or advantage to seek except that of the State they serve ; even their patronage has been greatly reduced since the civil appointments are thrown open to public competition. It would be difficult to quote another instance of men devoting their time and talents to the government of an empire with so little personal remuneration or aggrandisement.

The East India Company holds its trust from Parliament, and Parliament is the fit tribunal to review its administration and to correct its mistakes ; but we apprehend that no one, who has at heart the welfare and stability of the Indian Empire, can desire to see a more direct and active control exercised by the English House of Commons in its affairs. It is no reproach to the House of Commons to say, that its deliberations on the affairs of India have commonly alternated between passion and indifference, and that both conditions are alike unfavourable to a calm judgment on a most intricate subject. These evils may be aggravated by the artifices of debate, and the opinion of a popular assembly is liable to be grossly abused, when it has to decide on matters so remote from the experience of this country, especially when they are mixed up with party interests.

But above all, the direct and constant intervention of Parliamentary authority, if it were possible, would utterly paralyse the Government of India in India itself : there, and not in England, the strength of the Empire must lie ; there, and not in England, the perils, the opportunities, the risks, and the duties of the supreme power are distinctly visible. Every great and successful Governor-general of India has exercised a large uncontrolled power. He, and not the authorities at home, is the real Indian Minister, and nothing could be so fatal to the due exercise of his authority, as that he should be subjected to all the checks of Parliamentary Government. Choose the ablest man you can find ; give him large powers ; recall him if he fails in the use of them, but as long as he remains there, let him be the head of the Empire in the East. He is the servant of this country, but he is the sovereign of that ; and while he rules, it is more important to maintain his supremacy over the people of India, than to enforce his subjection to the people of England. Whatever tends to strengthen the machinery of



government in Calcutta, is of inestimable importance, for that is the true executive; the mode in which deliberations are conducted at home is of secondary importance.

We anticipate therefore but little practical benefit, and possibly some danger, from the controversies which will probably arise as to the transaction of Indian business in this country; but one result of far greater moment we do anticipate from the series of astonishing events which have roused the attention of the world. It is not to Leadenhall Street or to Cannon Row — to the Charter of the Company or to the authority of the Queen — that we look for a great and salutary change in the relations of this country to her Indian Empire. But the interest of the nation is for the first time riveted upon that country. It is by British capital, applied by British enterprise to native labour, that the revenues of India can alone be augmented, and her natural resources brought to light. It is by British troops that the authority of the supreme power can alone be securely upheld. The time is come when a code of laws, not servilely adopted from the Mohamedan Cadi or the Institutes of Menu, but framed by British Legislators, shall give equal protection to the rights of every creed. Adhering to the maxims of absolute toleration, which are due to the convictions of all our subjects, we claim the right to place the faith we ourselves profess on a footing equal at least to that of any other race. Education will continue to extend the knowledge of the language and the sciences of this country among the natives. Facilities of communication and of internal trade will open India to larger numbers of Europeans. A rebellion has broken out against the progress of civilisation. Myriads of barbarous and fanatical enemies assailed the small but dauntless band, which stood as the vanguard of their country. Not one failed — not one doubted of the ultimate result — for they knew that the people of England would rescue or avenge them. And so it is with the cause for which they fought. Superstitions, jealousies, ignorances, dangers, surround it, but the cause is that of truth and duty. It will hold its ground until fresh resources increase its energy and establish its power.

ART. II.—*History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V.* By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. 6 vols. London: 1854-55.

THE history of man, in its highest and truest aspect, is beyond doubt the history of his religion; and the historian who disregards this keynote of his work, will scarcely atone for the fatal omission by the most varied learning and the most persevering labour. Political calculations, the enterprise of commerce, the development of art, may appear at times to swallow up all other desires and aims; but under this outer surface the real current of human life will be showing constant signs of its existence and its power. Diverted, it may be, or repressed for a time by the force of circumstances, by conscious opposition, or contemptuous neglect, it will be slowly gathering strength, until its stream bursts forth with greater impetuosity than ever. History then, in the discharge of its highest functions, must in the records of every age bring out most prominently the religious life of man; must, in tracing the course of modern civilisation, examine, at once carefully and widely, the influence and the workings of Christianity.

Yet, on a superficial glance, the field is scarcely an inviting one. The gravest and most generous impartiality will admit that at best it exhibits but too often a splendid promise with a miserable failure in its accomplishment — beneficent principles with injurious results. To men of narrower and more partial understandings, a dark mist overspreads the scene, breaking only here and there to reveal fearful conflicts between antagonistic creeds and hostile institutions — the merciless cruelty of the orthodox conqueror, the excruciating torments of the heretical victim — the extirpation of human tenderness, the consecration of a boundless inhumanity. The implacable severity which found its victims alike in nations and individuals, which hunted out the Albigensian and the Lollard, the Jew and the Templar, which consumed in the same fires the heretical opponent of theological dogmas and the orthodox assailant of ecclesiastical corruption, spreads its dark and ghastly colouring over every page of Christian history.

It is however no slight error which permits prejudices so narrow and fallacious to warp the mind into a feeling of indifference or contempt for what may seem mere records of ecclesiastical

sins against justice and charity; and it is a far graver error, when a writer suffers the feeling of indifference to pass into that of hatred, and then undertakes what is practically the task of writing the history of Christianity as the avowed ally of its most determined opponents. The effects of the former error are in great measure neutralised by their silence; the latter has disfigured the magnificent yet melancholy achievement of Gibbon. We discern, scattered through that memorable work, the signs of an artificial antagonism, of differences purposely heightened, of animosity designedly embittered; but, taking the standing ground of the historian of the Decline and Fall, an impartial and philosophical mind must perceive that his method of treating the subject does not harmonise with all its phenomena, that it fails altogether to account for some of them. Admitting every instance of imposture and deception, repudiating every effort to advance the power of Christianity by violent means of whatever kind, there must have been at work influences of a higher nature to explain adequately the advance not merely of human theories, but of human practice now, when contrasted both with theory and practice two thousand years ago.

If there is something to sober, there is everything to console us in this gradual advancement of human society; and the task of tracing out this growth, and recording its several stages, is one worthy of the highest mental powers and moral qualities. Entering the world silently and unfelt, with no claim to earthly power or any supremacy but that which was yielded to it by consent of the will, Christianity, in its earliest age, baffles our attempts entirely to determine its peculiar character. Many of its features it is impossible not to discern: but whether the professors of the new faith lived as members of the commonwealth in which they were placed, or withdrew, as a distinct society, from all polluting contact with the world, — at what time they were separated from the ancient system to which at first they had exhibited no open antagonism, — whether they hoped to accomplish their mission by moulding men imperceptibly to their own standard, or by an avowed warfare against every system of law and polity which was contradictory to it, — when and in what way this new influence made itself felt in the world of imperial Rome, then almost commensurate with the habitable world, — all these, with many others, are questions which we can neither answer fully nor determine with confidence. Yet this society, so mysterious in its origin, so limited in its extent, has from that time to the present continued to be a manifest and sensible power influencing the destiny of man. Rising up slowly, and for a time almost unperceived, under the

colossal shadow of Roman dominion, in the midst of effete religions, of a mythology in which few cared to place any belief, of philosophical systems which most felt to be but a poor substitute for worn-out creeds—sometimes barely tolerated, sometimes (and that chiefly under the better emperors) oppressed and persecuted—it became in the space of three centuries, too powerful for the master of the Roman world to confront as an enemy, too majestic to be otherwise than courted as an ally, if not revered as a teacher and a friend. Coextensive from that time forth with the wide circle of Roman supremacy, it found for itself a home in the hearts and minds of Europeans, Africans, and Asiatics. Taking up their forms of thought, their systems of philosophy, their ideas of art and government, it shaped itself in some degree to their requirements, it moulded them in far greater degree to its own. It has sometimes asserted with fearless bravery its mission as the benefactor and saviour of mankind, it has fallen at others to become a machine of political intrigue and tyranny. And not unfrequently, at one and the same time, it has seemed in the acts of synods and councils to make Christian duty synonymous with the acceptance of dogmatic propositions, while by its missions it has been drawing barbarous nations and savage clans within the borders of civilisation, and conferring upon them more than the highest temporal advantages.

With all this inconsistency, perplexing only from a narrow and partial point of view, it has in its workings and its fortunes exhibited a marvellous correspondence with those of the people amongst whom it was set up. It adhered in the East to one type unchanged and unchangeable; it adopted in the West the traditions of Roman polity, or emerged with new strength amongst barbarous and ferocious hordes. It has acknowledged the influence not only of philosophical systems, but of language and of art. It was diverted by the luminous subtlety of Greek diction into speculations as fruitless as they were inexhaustible; it achieved, in unison with Latin thought and expression, the renovation and extension of the huge fabric of Roman dominion.

Yet more: in the midst of endless fluctuations, perhaps in consequence of them, it has at no time and scarcely in any place failed of effecting some good and uprooting some evil; it has ever been the instrument of conveying incalculable blessings, and of checking the inroads of ignorance and barbarism. It has kept alive the very principles of justice and morality in ages when the wickedness of man seemed destined to extinguish them. Its influence has mitigated the horrors of warfare and allayed

feuds, when feuds and warfare were the great and paramount occupation of life. It has modified where it could not change: it has alleviated the bitterness of the yoke where it could not remove the burden. It has confronted dangers the most opposite, contingencies the most varied; has exhibited the image of calm majesty, of mild and serene greatness, while all beside it seemed plunging into a chaos of anarchy and violence.

From these, the phenomena of its history, it remains to draw the legitimate inferences; and he who would approach them with the determination to find support for particular systems and the evidence of unchangeable institutions, may, by dint of learning or ingenuity, find something to justify every proposition and uphold every system; but he will find much more to perplex and bewilder him. As he who enters the fabled hall of Eblis must bid farewell to hope, so he who would judge in this way of Christian history, must resign his title to a calm and tranquil impartiality. He must yield up the first qualification of a historian before he enters upon his office. For his aim is to maintain principles which admit of no exceptions, and to which the admission of any exception must in strictness of speech be fatal. Disguise it therefore from himself as he may, he will be under the influence of an irresistible temptation to warp facts or to colour them, to impute evil motives to good men and right motives to bad men. His sympathies will be unduly excited on one side, while they will be as unduly repressed on the other. He will refuse to recognise the evil in Gregory the Great, or Hildebrand, or Innocent III., the good in Henry IV., or Frederick II., or Sigismund.

But even if unbiassed by the desire to sacrifice rigid justice to any private object whatsoever, a writer may lack the warmer feelings and livelier sympathies which seem absolutely necessary to impart life and vigour to any historical narrative: and generally there is a close connexion between this unbending impartiality and a cold, perhaps almost indifferent, temperament. In its logical conclusions, as well as in its practical effects, there are few things more vitiating than what is termed Hero-worship,—the idolising of an individual through all his actions as the embodiment of certain principles, instead of valuing him for those actions merely which accord with those principles. A safer guide is to be found in that ready sympathy which embraces all systems and refuses not to acknowledge the better points even of those whose lives deserve little forbearance in the balance of historical criticism.

Such, in faint outline, are the qualifications necessary for the historian of Christian times, and such the vast field which he

must traverse. To these qualifications few could lay better claim than the Dean of St. Paul's, and no writer of our time could delineate the several phases of Christian history, with greater brilliancy and animation, or with sounder judgment and more solid learning. The period of the Middle Ages has twice before been surveyed by English historians of no common eminence, but we are guilty of no disparagement to them in asserting that Dr. Milman has completed their work. That element of ecclesiastical power and influence, which was an object of scorn and aversion to Gibbon, and of comparative indifference to Hallam, has now, for the first time, by any English Protestant writer, been restored to its true position as the vital centre of mediæval society, civilisation, history, and art. The subject of this history is professedly confined to that of Latin Christianity; but as the religious history of man involves in fact his whole history, so that of Latin Christianity is virtually the history of Christianity throughout the world. The essential distinction, however, between the religious developments of the East and West, Dean Milman has seized with happy originality and drawn out with the greatest force and clearness; nor have the fundamental differences of idea, which lay at the root of this diversity, been traced to their source with equal discernment by any preceding writer, or set forth in such masterly relief.

The history of Latin Christianity is the record of every intellectual change which has befallen the speculative East and the practical and politic West. It brings before us the several forms of sacerdotal religion; controversies on subjects which transcend human comprehension, and on others which arise out of every system even of moral philosophy; controversies respecting the constitution of the Divine Nature, controversies on the causes and motives of human actions, on the essential distinctions of matter and spirit, of good and evil. We watch the struggles of conflicting ideas, borrowed, some from the mystic anti-materialism of Zoroaster, some from the bewildering physical science of Egypt; we look on the battle between monasticism and every feeling, impulse, and affection of our common humanity; on the further struggle of Eastern monachism, not only against human appetites and passions, but against almost every exercise of the mind and intellect. We see the Eastern Church contenting itself with endless quarrels for the meaning of a word, while the Western is assailed by savage armies, and in turn taking captive its conquerors. We behold the patriarch of Constantinople the toy and puppet of orthodox or heretic emperors, while the haughty Vicar of the Prince of the Apostles

is setting his feet upon the necks of kings. We follow the missionaries of Rome gathering in their harvest from the chilly climes of England and Germany, of Bohemia and Friesland, while the sword of Abu Bekr and of Omar flashes amidst the myrtle groves of Damascus and the standard of the prophet floats above the hallowed shrine of Mount Zion. We survey centuries of wild and violent enthusiasm, of turbulence, which threatened all society with one common ruin, finding a vent in those strange adventures which identified physical valour with personal devotion. Bursting forth in the first outbreak of resistless fanaticism, the hosts of the Crusaders were borne with a singleness of purpose not unworthy of admiration against the oppressor of Christendom, the Caliph of the false prophet, the polluter of the Holy Places. Then, as in each succeeding age the fire of religious zeal becomes less fierce, each new crusade betrays something more of cool design or double-minded calculations, until that becomes a system which was first evoked by a fiery and irresistible impulse. A crusade against the heretic will confer the same sanctity with a crusade against the infidel; and the name of De Montfort will be held not less illustrious than that of Godfrey or Tancred or St. Louis.

From this turmoil of arms and warfare we pass to the scarcely less vehement tumults of the schools of Western Christendom, those marvellous abodes of indomitable human perseverance, of boundless though misdirected and barren learning. We look upon the astounding monuments of gigantic labour left in their pyramids of tomes on the whole circle of human knowledge, in which every subject of thought is analysed with the most searching anatomy and a systematic precision which seems to clear up every perplexity while in fact it removes none; until these schools are invaded by the Dominican and Franciscan, and the mightiest masters surpassed in their highest dialectical subtleties by the members of this new papal army which professed at first to despise the intellect as much as they professed to despise money; and their disputations are rendered illustrious by the rivalry of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, of Albert the Great, of William of Ockham, and Alexander Hales.

Mighty, indeed, is the array of names, memorable and familiar, which in the history of Latin Christianity must pass before us:—among the champions of monasticism Jerome and Gregory, Benedict and Bernard and Peter Damiani, Dominic and Francis: in the strife for sacerdotal pre-eminence the representative of Charlemagne humbled before the bowed and drooping form of Hildebrand; and the magnificent Frederic II.

urging a scarcely effectual warfare against the Pope, who had, as fame avers, beheld a hundred winters: the haughty Philip Augustus and the dastardly John of England, the Kings of Arragon and Navarre, trembling at the behests of Innocent III., or resisting in vain the material and spiritual weapons of papal warfare: Simon de Montfort and Raymond of Toulouse, Thomas à Becket and Stephen Langton, Frederick Barbarossa and Conrad the last of the line of Hohenstaufen, John Huss and his betrayer the Emperor Sigismund, Philip the Fair and his victim Du Molay the last Grand Master of the Templars, Berengar and Abelard, Petrarch, Rienzi, Danté, — names great for their success or their misfortunes, for their sanctity or their crimes, — names illustrious in the annals of scholastic theology, of science and art, in poetry and painting, — names celebrated for achievements alike gigantic and useless, or for works of beneficence deserving endless gratitude, — all in their several times and places pass across the historic scene, each with their several associations, grouped amidst those for whom they toiled and suffered, whom they protected or tormented, and to whom they were a blessing or a curse. All, it may without qualification be said, have here received their fitting delineation; all live and act, suffer and triumph before us, so far as the pen of the historian may summon back the departed spirit.

With his wide and generous appreciation of the most various dispositions and the most opposite forms of government, philosophy, or art, it would be vain to expect from the Dean of St. Paul's anything of the language of a partisan; and he will be altogether disappointed who approaches these volumes in the hope of finding arguments or evidence for strong sacerdotal or anti-sacerdotal theories. Evidence is to be found throughout, the clearest and the most forcible, for the Divine origin and the sacred mission of Christianity itself; but none for papal claims and hierarchical pretensions, none for systems which would limit Christianity to the rigid acceptance of dogmatical propositions. It is the happiest omen for the future history, not only of literature, but of thought and religion, when the writer of such a work as this commences his task with the following declaration: — 'I presume not, neither is it the office of the historian, to limit the blessings of our religion either in this world or in the world to come. "There is One who will know his own." As a historian, I can disfranchise none who claim, even upon the slightest grounds, the privileges and hopes of Christianity; repudiate none who do not place themselves without the pale of believers and worshippers of Christ, or of God through Christ.' (Vol. i. p. 9.)



In the Papacy therefore, as in the growth of scholastic theology, or of its uncompromising foe, the jurisprudence of the middle ages, and in the career of Arnold of Brescia, or Wicliffe, or Huss, Dean Milman traces the direction and control of a Divine Power, and acknowledges its instrumentality in securing the greatest blessings of religion and knowledge to mankind. But the method of his history has rendered anything like controversial attitude or argument superfluous. The Papacy of the Middle Ages was a power, rising gradually to importance, from an insignificance necessary not only for its growth but its existence,—a power kept alive at first by the limited intellectual or practical vigour of its possessors, then gathering strength from controversies and feuds, from factions and schisms elsewhere, from the rivalry of contending patriarchates and the struggles of hostile sovereigns,—a power rising to pre-eminence from dangers which seemed to prelude its utter overthrow, and rendered at once predominant by the withdrawal of that imperial splendour, the accession of which was the death-blow to the ecclesiastical greatness of the Eastern Rome. That wonderful power was consolidated by the desertion of its own temporal master and the invasions of hostile chieftains, by the inroads of Alaric and the devastations of Vandals and Lombards, by the rule of Odoacer and Theodoric; for during these and other perils it pursued its onward course, sometimes by the mere force of moral influence achieving its greatest and worthiest triumphs; more often grasping at extended dominion by deliberate political calculations; sometimes defeated, generally successful; preferring perhaps to avail itself of fair means, yet not altogether averse from resorting to foul ones; waiting tranquilly until vague and ill-defined claims became, through the neglect or the impotence of civil rulers, strong precedents for rigidly defined principles. Even in its greatness were seen also the elements of its weakness and degradation. Checked in its strides towards universal supremacy by the opposition of foreign rulers, yet more by the traditional Roman ideas which still animated the citizens of the Seven Hills, it was constrained to assume the character of a temporal power, in order to maintain its ascendancy at home. Then followed all the inconsistency and tergiversation, all the fluctuations and confusion of a complicated and tortuous policy; the balancing of hostile states, the playing off of one faction against another, the unscrupulousness which turned the arms of the infidel against the refractory nobles or the turbulent populace of Rome,—the worldliness and trickery which sometimes gained its object, yet not unfrequently exposed it to humiliation and contempt.

In the men who wielded this power at one time so majestic, at another so despicable, so lofty or so degraded, so feared or so despised, are seen all the differences which correspond to, or rather which were, in whatever degree, the causes of these vicissitudes. Among them appear names which slander has never aspersed with the imputation of unworthy motives,—Innocent I., Gregory the Great, the first and the ninth Leos; others in whom the profession of the same high motives would seem to have been in some degree the result of self-deception, possibly of hypocrisy,—such as Hildebrand and Alexander III.; others, like Innocent III., who followed out a mistaken theory with greater conscientiousness than power, with greater facilities for tormenting mankind than for devising remedies for evils already committed. Nor are there wanting phases of their history more melancholy and more repulsive. Some spread the flames of war over the fairest regions of the earth; some lived as banditti rather than as men of piety and peace. The Papacy has passed through more than one dark age. The infamy of the son of Theodora in the tenth century is well matched by the infamy of John XXIII. in the fifteenth. Rescued by the stern integrity of the German popes from the depths of ignominy into which it had sunk under the minions of Theodora and Marozia, it reached its highest splendour from the pontificate of Gregory VII. to that of the successor of Innocent III. Then followed a time of boundless pretensions, urged by men deficient in moral greatness, the turbulent violence of Innocent IV. (the Genoese Sinibald Fiesco), of Boniface VIII., better known, perhaps, under his former name of Benedetto Gaetani. The Courts of Lyons and Avignon presented the spectacle of Roman popes, self-banished from their own metropolitan city, reduced to every species of chicanery, in order to escape from the toils in which they were caught,—of successors of St. Peter unable to retain their own patrimony, yet revelling in dissolute luxury in a foreign land, and leaving behind them vast treasures at which the world stood astonished. In this ‘seventy years’ banishment,’ while the miserable Clement V. sacrificed the most splendid order of Christian chivalry to the avarice or the fears of the French King, and yet scarcely succeeded by this sacrifice in shielding from his attacks the memory of his predecessor, there was growing up in the court of Avignon an unbelief more complete, a contempt of all religion and all restraint, altogether deeper than any which was so mercilessly punished in others.

With this array of popes varying from each other in all possible degrees of integrity and iniquity, there was, in truth,

no need to enter into the formal examination of more recent pretensions and developments. There was no need to assert in so many words that the Pope was not infallible,—either personally, with the lives of John X. and his execrable fraternity before us,—or officially, when they have been sometimes accused of heresy; sometimes compelled to appeal to a general council; sometimes repudiated by those councils; sometimes deposed by them. There was no need to refute the idea of an infallible guidance in matters of faith, with the spectacle of East and West divided, with council anathematising council, and popes and patriarchs launching their spiritual thunderbolts against each other. Still less was there any need to advert to fallacies so transparent as those which rest the papal claims on the possession of moral power, when that which they have possessed or exercised has been so frequently used to desolate the earth instead of furthering the kingdom of peace; when the offenders against the first principles of all law have been suffered to escape unpunished and unnoticed, and the rebel against canons and councils has been thrust into the dungeon or consigned to the stake; when offences against a remote consanguinity or spiritual relationship were hunted down, but license and profligacy were unchecked and unreprieved; when the ban of excommunication fell on the most enlightened of statesmen, the most judicious and clear-sighted of rulers, and miscreants dead to all sense of mercy and humanity were taken into its special favour. Evidence such as this, abounding as it does throughout the whole annals of the Papacy and of Christendom, it would be superfluous to strengthen by seeking for obscure early intimations of protests against papal pretensions, for ancient signs of suspicion and repudiation of Roman supremacy, for decrees of councils which asserted their own independence. It would be vain to attempt to overthrow it by referring to tomes of decretals (were they as genuine as they are false), by citing the most ancient precedents, by appeals to the gravest canons,—vain to rest on the promises of Scripture, or on that prior ground of the want which it is alleged that men must feel for an unerring guidance in the province of faith.

The Roman Church could not but have, from its situation, a sensible influence over all other nations. Rome was still, before the transference of the empire to the shores of the Bosphorus, the centre of the civil and commercial world. To it flowed the trade and the enterprise of all nations, and with these were imported every new theory, every fresh schism and heresy. Thither came those who had fallen under suspicion of departing from the faith, thither appealed those who had accused them

of corrupting the doctrine of Christ. Received by all these as an arbiter, if not a judge, the decisions of the Bishop of Rome were eagerly courted, and sometimes admitted by more than those in whose favour they were given. Yet the importance thus acquired was not sufficient to establish an inherent supremacy; there is not the slightest sign that during that period it was either entertained by, or had even suggested itself to, the minds of the bishops of Rome. Nor was it for a brief period that Christianity in Rome, and elsewhere in the West, remained Greek and not Roman. Its theology and ritual were alike Greek; till the age of Tertullian Latin Christianity could lay no claim to anything like a popular literature. And here manifestly (as the Dean has happily observed), is furnished the explanation of the singular fact mentioned by Sozomen, that for a long time after the introduction of Christianity there was no public preaching in Rome.

During this period the course of events was preparing the way for the separation of Latin from Eastern Christianity as a distinct and complete system. In the West the Church was identifying itself more and more with the language of old Rome, and separating itself from Greek forms of thought, Greek feeling, and Greek theology. In the second century Latin sermons were impracticable from the immense majority of Christians who spoke Greek. In the fourth century, Athanasius has, during three years' sojourn at Rome, to master the Latin language before he can venture to appear before the Pope with any confidence of being able to explain the subtle distinctions of the Trinitarian controversy.

But the popes were again favoured by their distance from the actual scene of this and the other early controversies. At the several eastern councils in which the Pope interfered at all, he was represented by his deputies. His absence enhanced his dignity, while it saved him from the unseemly turmoils which frequently disgraced those councils, and from being hastily committed in person to decisions which, when given by others, he might, if need were, repudiate. Yet before the Papacy could attain to something like its subsequent importance, it had to pass through a dark and discouraging ordeal. The persecution of Liberius by Constantius for his resolute defence of the great champion of the Trinitarian controversy; the intrusion of the Anti-pope Felix into his see; the fearful and bloody factions, which polluted the streets of Rome in the strife between Damasus and Ursicinus; could have left men but little time to anticipate the day when emperors would tremble at the behests of their successors.

Yet the danger was not so great, the crisis not so momentous, as it seemed to be. The dark cloud passed away, and Rome found herself advancing rapidly to spiritual dominion, and that from influences not altogether proceeding from herself. In the minds of Augustine, of Jerome, and of Ambrose, the magnificent idea of a spiritual monarchy, — of a theocracy with a visible hierarchy analogous to the subordination of angelic dignities, — had already received shape. In their writings it was given to the world. Probably before none of them, certainly not before Augustine, rose the image of the historical papacy of a later day. His city of God embraced not earth alone, but heaven. It had no mixture of worldly policy, it knew nothing of reliance on secular power. But the less definite outlines of this Divine kingdom upon earth harmonised well with the old ideas of Roman sovereignty, long dormant, but never altogether extinguished.

The elements of confusion and violence were at work both in the East and West — confusion in the former from contending religious factions, in the latter from the disruption of the old society by the inroads of barbarians. Amidst scenes of tumult and terror, Chrysostom, the world-famed orator, the dauntless reprover of royal license and popular corruption, had been driven from his patriarchal throne. Before the Bishop of Rome, Innocent (not less deserving than any other of the name of Great), he laid his appeal for a general council to judge between him and his intruding rival. That appeal availed not to win back for him the throne which he had lost; but a great accession of moral influence was the reward of the Pope for his steadfast maintenance of a righteous cause. Innocent had deplored the scenes of reckless anarchy in the streets and churches of Constantinople: he was now to witness the repeated inroads of the terrible Alaric with his savage Goths, the last struggle of pagan Rome with the destined instruments of its downfall. Twice repelled by the arms of Stilicho, for the third time, when Stilicho had fallen a victim to the infatuated frenzy of Honorius, the hosts of Alaric battered the walls of Rome, and were averted from their prey, not probably without the intervention of Innocent, at the price of a costly ransom. Master of the city of the Cæsars, he set up and dethroned one on whom he bestowed their empty title; and then again summoned his hordes to the onset, and let loose his legions for the final pillage of pagan Rome. By a happy fortune, Innocent was at Ravenna, on a vain mission to obtain succour from the powerless Emperor for the beleaguered city. The head of Western Christendom was not to witness her dying splendours extinguished in flames and

blood. The invader himself, it is said, was swayed by some strange influence towards the Christians. Against their persons and substance he forbade all violence; their churches he protected from desecration; only the worshippers of the ancient gods were abandoned to the swords and the license of his soldiery. Before the return of the Pope, pagan Rome had virtually ceased to exist. The forum, with its gorgeous temples which inspired the triumphant eulogies of Claudian on the victories of Stilicho, had lost its ancient majesty; the spell of the tutelar gods was broken. Palaces lay deserted, temples were left to decay. Rome was to spring from her ashes, Christian in her faith, in her art, and in her government; and in place of the old shrines and the old priesthood,—the pontiffs, and the flamens, and the augurs,—were to arise the temples of the Christian faith with their more magnificent hierarchy. The successor of the Galilean fisherman had inherited more than all their ancient sacerdotal dignity, more than the barren pomp of the titles of the old republic. Caring little for high-sounding names, he had attained a more solid power; he was now on the road to universal empire.

Twenty years later, the papal throne was filled by a worthy representative of Innocent I. Like him Leo the Great had to arbitrate in Eastern controversy, like him to witness the inroads of barbarians, yet with greater success to draw off the invader from the gates. The Huns of Attila were encamped on the shores of the lake Benacus. Leo went forth at the head of the ambassadors of Rome, and averted the storm from the devoted city. The populace had not yet lost all traces of their faith in the divination and mythology of old times. They attributed their deliverance to the stars, and thronged to the Circensian games: the pencil of Raffaele has immortalised the legend of the armed apparition of the Christian protectors of the Eternal city. Five years sufficed to bring against them a less placable enemy; and again Leo went forth to plead before Genseric the cause of his defenceless fellow-citizens. Some mitigation of the lot of conquered cities he did indeed obtain: those only who offered resistance might be killed, the captives should not be tortured or the buildings burnt. But beyond this the arm of the Vandal could not be arrested; and the few relics of heathenism, the statues which had been suffered to decorate the capitol after the pillage by Alaric, now fell into his hand and were carried away as trophies. The last links were broken between Christian and Pagan Rome. The ship which was bearing her gods to Carthage foundered at sea.

Thus far the papal supremacy, such as it was, had been for

the most part acquired by legitimate means and exercised for beneficial purposes. The great idea of unlimited dominion which had first been conceived in its completeness by the comprehensive mind of Innocent I., had made no slight advance towards its realisation under Leo the Great. But in this idea the notion of temporal supremacy was altogether subordinate. The empire, aimed at thus far, resembled rather the fairer vision which rose before the mind of Augustine. But if they saw the possibility of realising their idea, they could not foresee the force of circumstances in modifying or distorting it. Doubtless the moral influence of the popes was beginning more and more to influence the civil relations of Rome. It was the only power which then existed in the freshness of its early vigour. The empire of the West, already little more than nominal, was waning rapidly away. But long before the Papacy could appear as a temporal power, it must exhibit strange fluctuations and pass through more than one period of depression, apparently of decay. The resignation of Augustulus, which by the pompous pride of the Roman senate was interpreted into an assertion of the reunion of East and West under one emperor, is an event almost unnoticed in the papal epistles. The popes are busied with intrigues in the East, in battling with the pretensions of the patriarch of Constantinople to parity of honour with the see of Rome. Yet the substitution of the real empire of Odoacer for the empty sovereignty of Augustulus had a directly practical bearing of far greater moment than they had conceived. But the full consequences of this subjection were scarcely felt till the victories of Justinian had temporarily reunited the East and West under a single sceptre.

Before these events one interruption had occurred in the monotonous controversies of the Eastern Church. It came in the shape of an exhortation to peace, not from the spiritual but the civil power. The Henoticon of Zeno would have mitigated the acrimony of contending factions by removing the causes and objects of their discord; but the combatants were not to be so separated; and the vain attempt to bring about toleration ended in a schism between the two great divisions of Christendom which lasted for forty years. The Henoticon, like some other pieces of legislation and expressions of individual opinion, was both out of time and out of place. Like the Peace of the Empire proclaimed by Henry IV., like the premature civilisation of the Sicilian court of Frederic II., it spoke to men with whom forbearance and moderation were synonymous with absolute apostacy from all faith. Yet as indicating the course which should at a future time guide even

public opinion, as showing an appreciation of the principles of all fair dealing, every such act and declaration must be welcomed with a hearty satisfaction. They are indeed but few, and visible only here and there in the dreary waste of theological hatred, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness; they come from men whose words and actions have at other times miserably contradicted these better impulses. But they are not the less treasured up as genuine utterances of the unwarped human heart. 'To pretend to a dominion over the conscience is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief.' These may well be termed golden words (vol. i. p. 321.), but they come (it is hardly too strong a phrase) from the murderer of Boethius. Thoughts not unlike these we may find in the early national poetry of Teutonic Christendom, the practice of them may be seen in some measure in states founded on commercial rather than warlike enterprise, — in the rude strains of Cædmon and the tolerant policy of Venice. In one solitary instance does an ecclesiastic stand forth to bear the same righteous testimony. In that council to which John Huss and Jerome of Prague fell victims, Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, stood almost alone in repudiating the punishment of death for heresy. The rare occurrence of such protests enables us to realise more fully the mighty despotism which the doctrine of persecution exercised over the minds of men.

Until the sixth century, the popes had carefully avoided endangering their power or diminishing their dignity by attending even the gravest councils of the Church. They had now fallen upon darker days; and Theodoric compelled the successor of Hormisdas to go as his ambassador to Constantinople on the involuntary errand of toleration for the Arians and other heretics. Twelve years afterwards Theodotus, the unworthy representative of Theodoric, also sent the Pope Agapetus as his ambassador, rather to the advantage of the Pope than his own. Theodotus in his terror sought, by persuasion or threat, to avert the victorious arms of Justinian, or rather of his resistless generals. Agapetus found means to overawe the cowardly tyrant, to obtain the degradation of one patriarch and to consecrate another. After this temporary victory, the Papacy sunk deeper still. The names of Silverius and Vigilius, of Justinian and Theodora, recur again and again as the prominent



agents or victims in that dismal drama of treachery, banishment, and murder, which shows how completely the Papacy was shorn of its strength when removed from its own metropolitan city or involved in the intrigues and subjected to the caprice of a foreign court.

Nor were these the only humiliations to which the Roman pontiffs were compelled to submit. The vast code of Justinian invaded without scruple their spiritual province: it knew nothing, in fact, of their pretensions. To the moral, still more to the Christian philosopher, this gigantic fabric of jurisprudence presents subjects of paramount interest and importance. Professedly a Christian code, and asserting explicitly the orthodoxy of its theology, it stands forth as perhaps the surest test for measuring the influence hitherto exercised by Christianity upon the world. Its decisions with regard to the marital and parental relations, and the still more momentous subject of slavery, may not only throw a more valuable light on the method of its working, but furnish grounds for auguring the course of its future influence on the forms of thought and the destinies of mankind. To the papal historian it is no less the criterion by which to measure the degree of power to which the Roman pontiffs had attained. The emanation of all authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, from the temporal sovereign, was the first principle of Justinian's legislation. Recognising the primacy of the See of St. Peter, and insisting, in accordance with the centralising ideas of old Roman law, on the union of all churches in submission to Rome, it determines the limits of that pre-eminence and the boundaries of its jurisdiction. The head of Roman Christendom is the subject of the Roman emperor. He must bow before the imperial decrees; he must, if called upon, publish them in all his churches. The Papacy owed its subsequent aggrandisement chiefly to those circumstances which concurred to keep the Roman civil law in the background, and for a time almost to conceal its existence. The aim of Justinian was to legislate for the empire at a time when it professed once more to be commensurate with the world. When, through its inherent weakness and the encroachments of Mahomedanism, the unstable fabric was again dissolved, Western Christendom was too soon involved in relations with Teutonic races to leave the Roman civil law much hold on the popular mind. The legislation of Charlemagne contained indeed enactments no less opposed to ecclesiastical pretensions than those of Justinian. But his munificent donation, while it was reason enough for the Roman pontiff to keep silence, laid the foundations of a substantial power which might be effectually wielded

against a ruler of less comprehensive and vigorous mind. This legacy of material power continued in the hands of the popes to cast a veil over absolute theories of civil supremacy, until these again found the most determined champions in the civil lawyers of Paris. The Papacy had almost beaten down the resistance of Teutonic sovereigns, when these men raised up a more formidable foe in the great code of Roman law. Amidst the subtle theories of the schoolmen and the bold assertions of the canon lawyers, the steadiness with which they ignored the one, the boldness with which they appealed to decisions and enactments older than the other, was the most incontestable evidence of the re-awakening of the human intellect.

That the principles of Justinian's ecclesiastical legislation should retain their force in the West during the times of Gregory the Great, was a manifest impossibility. The conquests of Odoacer left, even if they did not find, Italy in an indescribable condition of desolation and misery. The cultivation of the land had in many districts wholly ceased. Famine and disease had in some places almost extirpated the population. Against these causes of weakness his own rule effected but little; even that of Theodoric perhaps not much more. In Rome itself poverty and epidemics had completely prostrated the popular spirit; the hands of the temporal power were paralysed. There was no hope whether for internal order or external defence except in the wisdom and fortitude of its bishop. The defenceless city again trembled at invaders whom rumour described as more terrible than any who had preceded them. That peace which Innocent had by his mediation sought to accomplish with Alaric, and Leo with Attila and Genseric, Gregory essayed to obtain from the detested Lombards as bravely and more successfully. The arms of the invaders were arrested, and the invaders themselves converted from a questionable heresy to orthodox Christianity. Gregory had conquered, but by means for which he needed not to blush. He had acquired temporal power, but it had been thrust upon him rather than sought by him. A feeling of complacency might be pardoned for the consciousness that his elevation had been brought about by no acts which could disgrace a Christian prelate.

The facts of Gregory's life exhibit so fine a sense of equity and generosity, with so many instances of perversion scarcely to be called less than iniquitous, so judicious an application of means to ends, so keen a discrimination between the shadow of power and the substance, a learning so profound yet so narrow and bigoted,—that we at once see in him the type and the product

of his age. The same man who had saved Rome from all the miseries of war and famine, who had bestowed on it the blessing of a firm and legitimate government, whose wide sympathy had conferred on distant northern countries the still higher blessing of Christianity, who had shielded Jews from exaction and oppression, who by the sale of consecrated vessels from the altar for the redemption of captives had shown that the substance of religion was with him of greater moment than its form,—is found to triumph with unrestrained exultation over the slaughter of a sovereign who, if he had treated him with indifference, had at least been the benefactor of his people; to eulogise in the most fulsome terms, and to invest with the highest sanctity, one of the most execrable murderers that ever usurped a throne. But, as Bayle observes, the Emperor Maurice favoured the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Gregory saw the destruction of a rival authority in the sanguinary triumph of Phocas.

The answer to all these terrible inconsistencies is to be found in the fact that Gregory was both a churchman and a monk. It is impossible to understand the Middle Ages without understanding the character of such a man as Gregory. It is impossible to judge rightly of him without examining the several influences involved in the ideas of sacerdotalism and monachism.

Wide as were the differences between Eastern and Latin Christianity, greatly as they were opposed to each other in spirit and development, these varieties had for their groundwork the assumption (tacit or explicit) of one all dominant and penetrating principle. Already underlying the religious life of the East, and showing some signs of its influence on the West, this idea struck its deepest roots and gained its highest power in and by the writings of Augustine and of Jerome. But in the East it was chiefly discipline, in the West chiefly theology, which was affected by this principle. The inexhaustible subtlety of Eastern thought impelled it to exhaust itself in endless disquisitions on the nature of Divine existence. The relations of the Three Persons of the Trinity, the mysteries of the Incarnation, of the Divine and Human natures in Christ, were debated and defined in Greek with that copiousness the want of which an Eastern theologian bitterly deplored in the Latin. These controversies were indeed imported into the West: they found something like a congenial soil in Spain and Southern France; but they presented no great general attraction for the Western mind. The Roman Church (as Dean Milman has justly observed) was in reference to them the patient scholar of the great lights of Eastern orthodoxy. Still if the

West regarded these controversies with comparative indifference, there were others into which it threw itself with the keenest appetite, and which were peculiarly its own. In the West Manicheism fastened on the subject of the human will, which it had failed to affect in the East. In its practical recognition of the principle which was common to Manicheism, Gnosticism, and Orientalism generally, in aiming at the utter extinction of human affection, in regarding the body as a polluted prison-house and its sustenance a disgraceful necessity, in waging war with everything that might elevate and adorn life,—no system could surpass the monasticism of the East. Its hermits who macerated their withered frames in caves and dens, its saints who on the summit of pillars practised their austerities to the admiring awe of surrounding multitudes, may fully rival the ingenious self-torments amongst the wildest devotees of India. But these very torments, this very self-abnegation or self-extinction, exhibited the grandest effort of their free will. It was that phase of Manicheism which, asserting the corruption of matter, asserts also the power of the soul to abstract itself from it, and after its triumphant struggle to claim, as a right, its reward from that spirit with which it has identified itself. Whether or not the theory was a practical deification of the human will, whether it repudiated the necessity of Divine Grace in compelling the Deity to accept the voluntary victim,—these were points which the fervid recluse of the East never paused, perhaps never cared, to examine. With him the principle of Manicheism became a passion. He plunged into a deadly strife with all natural affections; he surrendered himself impetuously to a wrapt and mystic contemplation; he crushed with indiscriminate determination his body, his soul, and his intellect. Separation from mankind, with alternating reveries and tortures, was the one end and aim of his existence; and the monks of the East consequently failed to exercise any influence by the more commanding powers of the heart and mind. If they mingled at all in worldly affairs, it was as a furious rabble with passions rendered utterly malignant by a coarse and narrow fanaticism. The learning and the eloquence of the Benedictine, the impassioned rhetoric and consummate science of the Dominican and Franciscan, were no objects for emulation to the grovelling asceticism of the East.

But from these conclusions, which implicitly denied the reality and absolute necessity of Divine Grace to determine human action for good, the mind of Augustine shrank with a concentrated aversion. He had zealously examined the whole Manichean philosophy. He had weighed its theories in the balance, and, as

he thought, found them all wanting. One, however, (and that which lay at the root of the whole system, and of systems so far differing as those of the Gnostics and the Arians, of Nestorius and of Eutyches,) continued to exercise over him a power more intense and despotic than before. He had cast aside their dualistic tenets, with all those which converted the Redeemer of man into a phantom and his passion into a fiction; but his unshaken conviction of the impurity of matter threw him back with increasing force on the grace of God as the one motive power to good in the heart of man. Between the latter and this, the direct working of the Divine Spirit on his individual being, this immediate inspiration, nothing must be suffered to intervene. If from the prison-house of corruption in which men found themselves any emerged to light and safety, it was the direct act of God, and, as such, foreknown in his eternal counsels, irresistible, irreversible. This position, with its terrific converse, became, with him, the foundation of his whole theology, and on it was built up, not only the monasticism, but also the sacerdotalism, of the West. The separation of the soul and body from surrounding temptations and the natural relations of society was the one path which could warrant the entertainment of any hope of future safety. His theory was not, indeed, consistent on all points; and that such a man as Augustine could either be unconscious of or disregard this inconsistency, shows the unbending determination of his will, the predominant influence of passion over judgment. To the Roman Church, with its traditional monarchical ideas, with the systematic ritualism of its faith, the theology of Augustine was especially congenial and peculiarly welcome. The world was a mass of evil; who should be delivered from it, was a fact eternally predetermined in the Divine Mind. But this conclusion, so terrifying when stated thus nakedly, became full of consolation, when the circle of Divine Mercy was declared to be coextensive with that of the Church of Christ upon earth. At once such maxims as those of Cyprian were endued with an authority far greater than any which he had anticipated for them. At once was realised in its completeness the idea of that society, within whose limits salvation was guaranteed to men, and on obedience to whose constitution depended the participation in its benefits. Here then that system, which so far as it treated of Divine Grace was pre-eminently individual and immediate, subjected itself to the strictest hierarchical law. The same position which limited salvation to those within the pale of the Church, limited it also to those who partook of the Sacraments of the Church. The path was clearly defined: and that vast mass of mankind to whom an infallible

guidance is everything, found an indescribable repose under the shadow of that priesthood, which was to them the sole steward, the only dispenser of all divine blessings. But this system did not leave the members of that priesthood to bear a lighter burden than that of the multitudes to whom they conveyed spiritual life and food. They must exhibit the highest standard of the character required from all who would escape the defilements of the material world. Celibacy—or, as they delighted to term it, holy virginity—must become the condition of the clergy; not for the reasons of expediency given by St. Paul (for these and all such were indignantly disclaimed), but because thus only might the hierarchy discharge their sacred offices without defilement and contamination.

The same standard of perfection was proposed as the great object to be aimed at by all who would desire to be conformed to the Divine will: and thus was built up the fabric of western monasticism. Through the manifold and ever-changing phases of its history, which the Dean of St. Paul's has delineated with a peculiarly happy strength and perspicuity, it is impossible for us to follow it now; but no otherwise than by analysing the principles of its growth can we account for the fact, that Western monasticism was producing men like Gregory the Great, while that of the East was producing Simeon Stylites; that the latter absorbed every faculty in a dull routine of useless ecstasy, or sent men into the world with every brute passion let loose in exaggerated ferocity, while the former subdued men in the cloister to send them forth to subdue mankind by their practical wisdom and energy. In no other way can we account for the combination, in the West, of so much that is lofty with so much that is degrading, of so much heroism with so much coarseness, of so great self-abnegation with so complete a want of real charity. Above all, in no other way can we account for the individual character of the whole of mediæval Christianity,—for that intense concentration on self, for that absorbing pursuit of those qualities which involve no reference to any but those in whom they are nurtured, for that religion which is enshrined in the celebrated manual of mediæval piety, the '*Imitatio Christi*.'

We linger round a subject which, melancholy as it may be, brings with it no little instruction, and, it may be hoped, no little encouragement. We watch with sadness the extreme conclusions into which exaggerated positions must mislead men, the degree to which moral perception may be perverted and the dictates of our common humanity set at nought. The conviction of Jerome (vol. i. p. 105.), that all the horrors of a plundered city, all the enormities of Alaric's soldiery, were more than miti-

gated, were compensated, by the resolution with which Demetrias preserved her virginity; the indignation of Gregory I., which pursued, even after death, the body of a brother who confessed to possessing three pieces of money; the calm (could it be remorseless?) inroad made by St. Bernard on the cheerful and blameless happiness of his domestic hearth; the moral blindness which consecrated filial disobedience when displayed in the cause of monastic purity; the tradition which smote with sudden death the child whose thoughts reverted to his parents with more than legitimate tenderness; the wild enthusiasm of Benedict, the dark and repulsive coarseness of Peter Damiani, the stern practical vigour of Dominic, the keener austerities of Francis,—all reveal the intensity of influences which perhaps with the utmost effort we can scarcely realise. But the picture is presented in scarcely more than faint outline, until we look upon their early devotion, their later luxury; their voluntary ignorance, and their profound learning; their rapid degeneracy, their constant reforms; till we see monasticism in the West girding itself for heroic enterprise and patient labour; till we see it reclaiming deserts, civilising wild tracts, winning heathen nations to Christianity, while that of the East seems dead to everything but its placid self-contemplation; till we see it rousing, strengthening, directing the mighty impetus of the Crusades, marshalling armies against infidels in Palestine and heretics in Provence; till we discern its indomitable perseverance in adding to the sum of human learning—its equal resolution in extinguishing the free exercise of human thought; the marvellous tomes of its science—the majestic and awe-inspiring achievements of its art; its purifying influences—its debasing superstition; the dusky chapel with its dismal array of relics and relic-worshippers—the glorious choir raising the very heart to heaven; the smoke-dimmed picture that works its miracles and prodigies for the awestruck herd—the ineffable purity and peace that breathe in the beatified countenance limned by the hand of Fra Angelico.

While then the idea of Eastern Christianity was not less sacerdotal or less Manichean than that of the West, it did not fasten itself with the same tenacity on the notion of government; and as it was not built upon any monarchical idea, so it was freed from the necessity of enforcing any monarchical organisation. But far different was the destiny of the Church of Rome. Before Hildebrand there had risen up an image more colossal, more earthly, than that which had animated the efforts of Gregory the Great. Gregory was a monk, therefore also a Manichean: but this principle, if it possessed any congeniality

with the mind of Hildebrand, was wholly subordinate to, if not altogether swallowed up by, the one absorbing passion of ecclesiastical dominion. His aim was to subdue the world by a spiritual army: but the result of his conquest was not to be confined to spiritual influence. It was to give him power over kingdoms, dictation over princes, the command of their weapons and their wealth. It was to humble civil polity under priestly autocracy: it was to prove (what Hildebrand scrupled not to assert), that the civil rule was in itself the mere development and working of the evil principle. But this conquest could only be achieved by a caste, not by an order. In the world of ordinary men there must be another world—of men removed from all worldly affections, embarrassed by no worldly ties, with no ambition to found a family or prolong a line; and because the marriage of the clergy was a fatal obstacle in this path, therefore, with a resolution immovably calm and steadfast, he determined to remove it. To the evils which must follow, such a man as Hildebrand could not possibly be blind. He had probably looked them all steadily in the face; had well weighed the impossibility of extinguishing, the certainty of perverting, human passions; the frightful misery which must be caused by the rude dis severment of existing ties, the demoralisation which must ensue on the prohibition of legitimate affection. It mattered not. The springs of human sympathy had long been dried up in Hildebrand. His conscience was vexed by no doubts of the identity of the kingdom which he sought to establish with the kingdom of that Saviour whose Gospel he professed to preach. The priesthood must trample on the lion and the adder, must rule over the bodies and the souls of men. In the world, they yet must not belong to it. Uncontaminated by worldly lucre, undefiled by human passion, their whole being must be absorbed in that of the great sacerdotal army which enrolled its soldiers from every rank and class of men. The path to greatness and distinction was laid open to men of the noblest lineage or of the meanest descent. Spiritual power, with all its temporal consequences, might be grasped by those whom the temper of society and the spirit of feudal legislation shut out from all hope of political greatness and celebrity. But this very power and opulence involved its own dangers, and presented its peculiar temptations. The serf or the slave was not precluded from attaining to it: could he avoid aiming at it from sordid motives, from the desire of money, the lust of temporal dominion? The possession of this power would enable him to practise on the terrors of mankind, whether to confirm his priestly authority, or to increase his earthly sub-



stance. Was it marvellous that the covetous or the baseborn chose the latter? Yet more, the tendency of feudalism was to make all offices and honours hereditary; but, as the author has observed, 'hereditary succession once introduced into the Church, the degeneracy of the order was inevitable; the title to its high places at least would have become more and more exclusive; her great men would cease to rise from all ranks and all quarters.' (Vol. iii. p. 168.) And hence the war which Hildebrand waged against clerical marriage was only another phase of that which he waged against simony.

Seeking therefore, by fair means or by foul, to promote sacerdotal aggrandisement, he was vainly striving to crush its genuine and inevitable offspring,—vainly endeavouring to maintain the integrity of his priestly army, while he desired to free them from all subjection to the civil power,—vainly shutting his eyes to the fact, that the success of his war against investitures must finally be the deathblow to his scheme of unbounded spiritual empire. The history of that struggle is at once magnificent and humiliating; and it has received ample justice in the thrilling narrative of the Dean of St. Paul's. Like Leo IX., like Innocent IV., and Boniface VIII., Hildebrand wins his victory over men of other lands only to fall by those of his own. The Emperor of the West had prostrated himself in abject supplication before the haughty pontiff at Canosa: the inexorable pope dies in exile, almost in captivity, at Salerno, with shaken faith in his own schemes, and a depression of spirit which called for the reproving consolation, 'In exile thou canst not die: Vicar of Christ, thou hast received the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.' (Vol. iii. p. 199.)

Hildebrand was dead; and the great army which he had organised went on in its career of conquest and degeneracy, holding continually a haughtier language and avowing more arrogant pretensions, while it sunk deeper and deeper in luxury, in avarice, in sensuality. The spectacle of its greatness overawed many; that of its corruption repelled and disgusted some. There may be in man little positive love of good, but there is a great dislike of hypocrisy and pretence. They who knew little, perhaps nothing, of the Gospel, could yet contrast the inconsistency of the spiritual claims of the priests with the tenor of their lives: others, who had some acquaintance with it, could not but see that the kingdom of the popes was in name, and in name only, the kingdom of Christ and of God. The contradiction gave birth to a zealous and orthodox desire of reformation in some, to an utter and contemptuous unbelief

in others. Against both the Papacy declared an indiscriminate and internecine war. If the fears and the resentment of the popes were roused by the scholastic subtleties or the incomprehensible philosophy of Berengar and Abelard, they were driven to an ecstasy of terror by the more orthodox protests of Arnold of Brescia. Berengar might succeed in procuring exculpation from Hildebrand; Abelard might find a friend in the venerable Abbot of Clugny; but the Brescian could hope for neither sympathy nor mercy from Hadrian IV., the poor English scholar, or Frederick Barbarossa, the Cæsar of the line of Hohenstaufen.

The civil and temporal powers met on this point in something like unison and harmony. With all their suspicion and animosity, the greatest sovereigns of Europe could not but feel that the foundations of their power were inextricably involved with the Papacy. It was the papal sanction which had aided to depose the degenerate Merovingian, the papal chrism which had anointed the first Carolingian king. It was the diadem of the ancient Cæsars, bestowed by the hand of Leo III., which rested on the head of Charlemagne. It was Hildebrand himself who, by the hands of his instrument Alexander III., had transferred the crown of England from the son of Godwin to William, the Bastard. Unity of interest overbore for the time all private grudge. The powers of the keys and of the sword, which would not meet to advance the happiness of mankind, met eagerly to persecute and slay. The emergency was indeed not slight. The gross repugnancy of sacerdotal practice with sacerdotal pretensions had roused into activity in some places the hearts, in others the intellects, of men. The impassioned harangues of Arnold of Brescia were sowing the seeds of future revolt on the shores of Zurich; the premature harvest of intellectual liberty was almost ripe in the fields of Provence and Languedoc. Strange indeed, and bewildering from their very number, are the conflicting phases of human life which pass before us in this period of wild commotion. With the strong sacerdotalism of the Middle Ages, side by side with the empire of the Papacy, among the movements of its spiritual armies, are seen mingling alien developments of civil liberty, ill-starred aspirations after intellectual freedom entertained many centuries too soon. The persecutors and victims alike are gone; but the sympathies of the English reader cannot be wholly withheld from the brilliant, if not faultless and unexceptionable, ideal of polity which was exhibited by the Sicilian court of Frederic II., and in the beautiful province of Raymond of Toulouse. And if he laments, as he cannot but lament, the indifference to religious

restraint, the unthinking joyousness, the splendid voluptuousness, which seemed striving to make life one long holiday and festival, he cannot but feel regret for so much promise harshly checked, for intellectual activity so mercilessly crushed, for art and science and social feeling and the recognition of human instincts so cruelly nipped in the bud. Strange inconsistencies also there are in some among the actors in this sad drama; but these he will not so much wonder at as pity. That such men as Bernard and Innocent III. should consider every means lawful, every weapon hallowed, against the wretched enemies of Christ and of his Church—that such horrible miscreants as Fulk of Marseilles and Arnold d'Amaury should, without a pang of remorse, involve in one common slaughter the aged and the young, the mother and her infant—that Simon de Montfort, cased in the triple armour of a heart harder than the nether millstone, should exult with savage joy over the massacres of his sword and the torments of the Inquisition—in all this there is little ground for perplexity and astonishment. But the weakness of human nature is painfully exhibited, when men like Raymond and Frederic II. themselves turn, or are compelled to turn, persecutors; when the former, secretly sympathising with his gay and happy people, is brought to aid in their extirpation; when the latter, with his protest against sacerdotal polity and religion embodied in his magnificent Sicilian paradise, can enforce its system, or at least its theology, on all his subjects, with an implacable severity worthy of Gregory IX. himself. Near in its ideal and similar in some points of its development as was the careless society of the troubadour with his own luxurious civilisation, yet not a sign is there to betray that he regarded with the least emotion its rapid and terrible catastrophe. His appreciation of their *gai science*, of their art and their luxury, was chilled and quenched by the vile crowd of Petrobussians, Paulicians, and Waldensians, by whom these careless voluptuaries were surrounded.

Praise is impertinent when bestowed on such a narrative as that in which the author relates this murderous crusade against the anti-sacerdotalists. Our limits admit of no full extracts, but we must cite a few words, not less for their justice than for their eloquence:—

‘Never, in the history of man, were the great principles of justice, the faith of treaties, common humanity, so trampled under foot as in the Albigenian war. Never was war waged in which ambition, the consciousness of strength, rapacity, implacable hatred and pitiless cruelty, played a greater part. And throughout the war, it cannot be disguised that it was not merely the army of the Church, but the

Church itself in arms. Papal legates and the greatest prelates headed the host, and mingled in all the horrors of the battle and the siege. In no instance did they interfere to arrest the massacre; in some instances they urged it on. "Slay all, God will know his own!" was the boasted saying of the Abbot Arnold, Legate of the Pope, before Beziers. . . . . We have the melancholy advantage of hearing the actual voice of one of the churchmen who joined the army at an early period, and whose language may be taken as an expression of the concentrated hatred and bigotry which was the soul of the enterprise,—the historian Peter, monk of Vaux Cernay. He is the boastful witness to all its unexampled cruelties. Monkish fanaticism could not speak more naturally, more forcibly. With him all wickedness is centred in heresy. The heretic is a beast of prey, to be slain wherever he may be found.' (Vol. iv. p. 209.)

Still more promising than the premature civilisation in Provence, was that of Frederic's Sicilian kingdom. Fame spoke of his large political views; of solid benefits conferred on his people; of bridges and roads which he had built and made; of cities which he had adorned; of his great universities in which the whole circle of human knowledge was cultivated; of their studies in science, in moral philosophy, in natural history; of their familiarity with Greek language and literature, with Hebrew and Arabic; of more elegant accomplishments in poetry, in sculpture, and in painting. 'The world had seen no court so splendid, no system of laws so majestically equitable; a new order of things appeared to be arising, an epoch to be commencing in human civilisation. But this admiration was not universal; there was a deep and silent jealousy, an intuitive dread, in the Church, and in all the faithful partisans of the Church, of remote if not immediate danger, of a latent design, at least a latent tendency in the temporal kingdom to set itself apart, and to sever itself from the one great religious empire which had now been building itself up for centuries.' (Vol. iv. p. 369.)

And thus the child, of whom popes had been the guardians, whose dominions had been sheltered under the wing of papal protection, found himself in mature manhood locked in a deadly struggle with Gregory IX., the stern old man whom age could neither subdue nor tame. The affection of popes had been alienated for ever, so soon as the imperial crown rested on his brow. He had headed a crusade; but so far from being suffered to atone for his transgression, it became itself one of his greatest sins. The fervour of crusading enthusiasm against infidels had passed away. The fiery zeal of Peter the Hermit, of Bernard, of Fulk of Neuilly, no longer drove millions to assume the cross. Frederic had made treaties where they had

slaughtered, had won by diplomacy what they had failed to obtain by the sword. His wisdom, his policy, his moderation, were all in vain. A dark strife preceded and followed the death of Frederic, till Manfred was slain in battle, and the head of the last of the Hohenstaufens fell upon the scaffold.

But the growth of enemies without, and of corruption within the Church, had roused opposition of another kind; and it was the wisdom and good fortune of the Roman pontiffs neither to repress nor to repudiate it. They found in the ranks of the new reformers a fresh, almost an infinite, accession of power. The Papacy, the Church of Rome, Christianity itself, seemed but too likely to lose its hold upon mankind, to be overwhelmed by a not undeserved contempt. Popes had filled the chair of St. Peter, in whom not a vestige appeared of the moral strength and greatness of men like Gregory I., or Leo the Great, or Hildebrand. All ranks and orders of clergy were seen hastening like birds of prey to seize on rich temporalities, utterly contemning their spiritual duties and wholly wrapt up in all-absorbing avarice and ambition. Profligacy and vice lifted up their unblushing fronts without rebuke and without hindrance. There was impunity for gross immorality, a heavy reckoning for fictitious or technical offences. Men preached without sincerity, and heard without conviction. They bowed before the despotism of Catholic orthodoxy, but not without some suspicions that fire and sword were not the most Christian arguments to be employed against those who fell away from it. The doctrine of persecution was too sacred to be assailed openly. Probably none were conscious of the real source of their discontent; but there was felt no slight indignation that such monstrous excesses as those of Simon de Montfort should either be necessary or permitted. The conviction was slumbering in many that the victory of the Church must be won by other forces and other weapons; and the conviction was kindled into active zeal by the preaching and example of Dominic and Francis. These men indulged in no deep ulterior schemes; but with the most complete singleness and sincerity of purpose declared their own mission, and enthralled the sympathies of thousands by the magic spell of their eloquence and their austerity. To manifest evil they applied a plain and direct remedy. Magnificence was to be displaced by a stern nakedness, luxury by ceaseless mortification, pride by humility, viciousness of life by sanctity which should be beyond question, earthly policy by spiritual simplicity, above all, simony with its frightful progeny by utter absolute poverty. All ranks and classes were infected by the contagion. The entire population of

towns and villages rushed to take the vows and bind round them the cord of Dominic and Francis. There was a hot, a maddening impulse to join the army of mendicants, as there had been to swell the armies of the Crusades. They raised no protest against persecutions; but their arms were not those of persecution. To quote Dean Milman's forcible observation, we cannot tell whether St. Francis would have burnt a heretic, he was never put to the test; but it is most certain that he would gladly have been burnt for him.

In the midst of the Albigensian war, these merciful men first interposed their benignant influence to extinguish its horrors or mitigate its sufferings. And all their power, the magic of their name, every faculty of their being, was placed as a tribute of absolute submission at the feet of the Roman pontiff. Henceforth there was no country in which the Pope had not an organised force owning no other obedience, but yielding infinite obedience to him, not one which he could not inundate with these determined votaries of the papacy, not one in which he could not fix these legions in permanent garrisons, or employ them in roving warfare against all enemies, ecclesiastical or civil. If his own life exhibited no influence higher than that of mere policy, or even showed the working of darker passions and vices, he might rely on these holy champions to make up for his deficiency, to distract attention from papal iniquities by the splendour of Dominican or Franciscan sanctity. The issue did not belie the promise. They became mighty props of the great edifice of papal empire; but they also opened new sources of weakness. The jealousy of faction took the place of that unity which had so pre-eminently distinguished the Roman hierarchy. The very institution of these mendicant friars was a tacit satire on the secular clergy, almost on the great monastic bodies. The special protection accorded by popes to these creatures of their will was a sign to the rest that they no longer enjoyed the first place in their affections, could no longer reckon on their highest favours. The celibate clergy, the great army of Hildebrand, found their loyalty cooling down, as they were confronted by these professors of a more austere and less worldly system. Yet more than this, the principle of monasticism, so wonderfully renovated by this novel application, followed rapidly in them the course of the old monastic orders. The acquisition of wealth gave the lie to their profession of mendicancy. Ample and spacious buildings sheltered men who had sworn to be without house or home. They had forsworn power; they grasped it with greater tenacity than any who had preceded them. They were bound to meddle with no temporal.

concerns; their interference was more constant, more searching, more concentrated than that of any others. But even these were not the limits to their restless activity and ambition. They had abjured the magnificence of art, the pride of human learning; and from their ranks came forth men famed throughout the world for their skill in the former and their attainments in the latter. The splendid Church of Assisi, rich with all the lustre of gold, and azure, and vermilion, rose above the naked edifice where Francis had worshipped, and where his bones reposed. Nations stood astonished at the profound science of Albert the Great and Thomas of Aquino. Men gazed with all the fervour of admiring devotion on the angelic countenances and placid forms which looked down with indescribable serenity from the walls and tablets of their choirs and shrines. No fascination was wanting to rivet the senses or the intellect. There was all the pomp of solemn ritual, all the gorgeoussness of priestly decoration; there was the echo of music unearthly in its touching sweetness or moving power, the gleaming robes, the censers, and the golden candlesticks. The relics of their saintly founders and generals were enshrined in coffers of lavish cost and workmanship. The altar glistened with its sumptuous cross, its jewels, and its brodered hangings.

Meanwhile the stream of Latin Christianity was diverging further and further from that of the East. Their mutual relations had almost from the first been those of hostile rivalry or ill-concealed schism. The Roman pontiffs and the Byzantine patriarchs had more than once lain, each under the other's ban, each under that excommunication which, in its literal force, consigned the offender to eternal irrevocable perdition. The days of Photius and Michael Cerularius had been followed by periods of increased estrangement and jealousy; and the prospect of reconciliation became the more hopeless as the controversy related to insignificant points of practice or incomprehensible points of theology. Nor had there been wanting more tangible grounds of alienation. The gigantic and disorderly armies which Western Christendom had set in motion for the rescue of the holy sepulchre and for the reunion of the divided churches tended directly to widen the breach, and render the gulf of separation impassable. The Crusaders had horrified the East with their violence, licentiousness, and ignorance; and the nominal reunion of East and West only concealed a division and exasperation more bitter than ever.

Once more, after an interval of two centuries, a feeble and abortive effort was again made for the reunion of the two churches. The Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople were received by

Pope Eugenius IV. at Ferrara, from Ferrara conveyed to Florence. Latin complaisance and adroitness achieved a deceptive and artificial reconciliation; but the whole history is rather a melancholy tragedy than the jubilant record of united Christendom. Not one of the actors in it but had lost something of his ancient power, and fallen from his ancient dignity. The feeble Palæologus was the representative of Constantine the Great, of Heraclius, of Leo the Isaurian;—a prelate yet more feeble was the successor of Basil, of the Gregories, and of Chrysostom. The Pope also had fallen, not indeed from the plenitude of his pretensions, but from the moral greatness, the temporal power of Leo and Gregory and Innocent III. In the persons of a few pontiffs, the papacy had preserved a questionable respectability; in such men as Boniface VIII. and John XXIII. it had become hateful and infamous. The councils of Ferrara and of Florence were held in opposition to that of Basle, which Eugenius had himself recognised as œcumenic. That of Constance had asserted the supremacy of general councils over all papal authority whatsoever. The magnificent schemes of universal spiritual empire were well nigh exploded, or had been transformed into mere aspirations for wealth or for the attainment of a place among the temporal sovereigns of Europe. The loftier views of Hildebrand and Innocent III. would have been absurdly misplaced in the miserable line of Avignonese pontiffs, in the baffled politician who betrayed the Templars to the avarice of Philip the Fair, in the luxurious if not sceptical Clement VI., the friend of Petrarch and Rienzi.

The issue of the Council of Florence harmonised well with the waning fortunes of the papacy. John VI. Palæologus returned to his imperial city, unaccompanied by the spiritual head of Eastern Christendom; and the visitor wonders to behold under the magnificent dome of Florence the tomb of Joseph patriarch of Constantinople. If little powerful and little known in his life, he was happy in the time and the circumstances of his death. He might console himself with the thought of reunited Christianity, whatever might be the value of the treaty. He was spared the indignant contempt with which the Greeks repudiated the decision of the council; he was not to witness the great catastrophe, when fifteen years later the crescent of the prophet glistened on the dome of St. Sophia.

The ancient rival of the papacy was humbled; a more formidable enemy was gradually consolidating its power elsewhere. The idea of vicarious sacerdotal religion, of absolute spiritual empire, was pre-eminently the idea of Latin Christianity. It struck its roots deepest in the Italian mind, to which it was but



the transformation of the traditions of ancient Rome. It appeared to have acquired an equal power over the other European nations. Yet, under the apparent adoption of this system there lurked a principle of self-reliance and independence, the occasional expression of which sometimes perplexed, more often irritated, the popes. To close and careful observers signs were not wanting that the idea of Latin was not identical with that of Teutonic Christianity—that the mind of Northern Europe had not entirely acquiesced in total prostration before a spiritual autocracy, was not altogether disposed to merge individual religious life in the routine of sacerdotal observances. The indications of this state showed themselves sometimes in the resistance of the civil to the spiritual power, sometimes in the assertion of a spiritual authority paramount to the papal; sometimes by a condemnation of priestly corruption and immorality; sometimes by an appeal to a higher standard than that of papal decretals or the canons of œcumenical councils. It seldom began with more than a protest against ecclesiastical abuses; it rarely stopped short with this. It sometimes exhibited a logical accuracy, but it was not unfrequently marred by a strange inconsistency. In both it betrayed the temptation, especially its own, to run into extremes. None carried out the ideas of irresponsible sacerdotal supremacy with more uncompromising pertinacity than some of the prelates of England and Germany; none more boldly avowed as the groundwork of their teaching a principle subversive of all authority, than some of the reformers of these same countries. The churchmanship of Hildebrand scarcely equalled that of Thomas à Becket: the fanaticism of a later day scarcely exceeded some of the principles (however it may have contradicted others) of Wicliffe, of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague.

To trace out the history of this Teutonic Christianity is not the object of the present volumes; we are compelled to pass over in silence the admirably dramatic scenes in which Dr. Milman has described the contests and the death of its first confessors and martyrs; and our limits forbid our following him even through that masterly survey of its tendencies, which was rendered necessary for the complete fulfilment of his own design. It is impossible to praise too highly the skill with which he has laid bare all the various influences at work to determine its character,—the hindrances to its advancement, whether in the scholastic theology, which fettered while it employed the intellect, or in the hold which a hierarchical religion had obtained upon the mind,—the growth of the great body of mediæval belief, the mixture of portions of it with that of Teutonic

Christianity, the gradual elimination of the rest. If his analysis shows that its course has been full of fluctuation, of uncertainty, of contradiction, it is a course the converse of which would have been almost incredible. The monstrous abuses of mediæval Christendom were doubtless scarcely less glaring than they are to us. The simony, the profligacy, the unbounded rapacity whether of the secular or the regular clergy, the luxury whether of princely prelates or of the mendicant armies of Dominic and Francis, were doubtless as hateful then to men of sincerity and integrity as they can be to any now. But it is scarcely too much to assert that we cannot adequately realise the power which the sacerdotal system exercised even over those who most abhorred these developments of it. It had laid its mysterious spell upon every faculty of the mind and every affection of the heart; it had included within the circle of its authority every branch of human learning; it claimed the absolute interpretation of the Gospel of Christ. It came before men with all the prestige of infallible guidance; it held the keys of life and death,—of life and death not only temporal but eternal. It guaranteed the former to all who obeyed its dictates; it irrevocably decreed the latter for all who lay beyond the pale of its communion. And for the vast mass of men, how great must have been the attractions towards that absolute guidance which mapped out and apportioned all human destiny both here and hereafter! How potent, to that temper of mind which desires to repose itself altogether, in unquestioning submission, on the dictates of supreme authority, must have been the charm at once of its consolations and terrors! The church was the ark of salvation; its sacraments imparted and sustained the life of the soul. The sense of sin, the burden of remorse, could be removed by the decree of priestly absolution. Present penance could atone for future pain; the prayers of the priest on earth mitigated the purgatorial torments of the departed spirit. But the church had also a rod for the chastisement of all offenders. She might impose days, or years, or centuries of penance; she could cut off the individual from her communion; she could place whole nations under interdict, suspend all religious offices, withhold the food of the soul here and consign it to the never-dying fire hereafter. It mattered not what might be the life and character of those who wielded this terrific power. The most licentious, the most violent, were still the representatives of Christ, armed with the same spiritual sword, charged with the same mediatorial office between God and man. Such, by a strange development, had been the issue of the sacerdotalism of St. Augustine. Founded (as we have seen) on a detestation of

any interference between the human soul and the operation of the divine spirit, protesting against everything which, like the theology of Chrysostom and his disciple Cassianus, tended to substitute a law for this immediate influence, it gave birth to a system which placed the Divine Being altogether in the back ground — which intruded a mortal into His seat of judgment — which determined the future lot of man by the decree of priestly authority — which instead of a moral interposed an ecclesiastical law between God and man.

Against this system, what could rise in more obvious contrast, than an individual religion? what protest could be more forcible than the denial of spiritual, nay, even of temporal power to all who were devoid of Christian holiness? The doctrines of Arnold of Brescia found a more congenial soil in the Teutonic mind; and that which Wicliffe held rather by implication than explicit assertion became the one animating principle of John Huss and his disciples. The enormous contradiction between the pretensions and the practice of the clergy, which roused the indignant reprobation of the most orthodox churchmen, which called into being the councils of Constance and of Basle, which inspired men like John Gerson and Robert Hallam with a yearning for practical reform, furnished to the countryman of Procopius and Ziska the weapon for demolishing the whole hierarchical fabric, and not this alone. A priest living in sin, is no priest; the exercise of his power is dependent on his purity of motive and of action. The same principle must apply to the civil ruler; and John Huss hesitated not to apply it in its utmost strictness. Its ultimate results he could not or would not see. His weapon enabled him to grapple with existing disorders, and he cared not to consider whether his idea of the Christian church were identical with that of Montanus and Novatian.

In truth, neither side saw fully the issues to which they were logically committed. In such men as Gerson and Hallam, the Teutonic spirit developed itself in the practical determination for a reform of existing abuses; in Wicliffe or John Huss, or even the Lollards, it sought to lay down a general principle to sanction and justify that reform. But Gerson and the orthodox reformers refused to acknowledge that their own position was fatal to the dominance of Latin Christianity, while Huss with his followers failed to perceive that their appeal lay to an authority which might at the least be wrested against themselves. The evils against which they protested were manifest, and acknowledged on both sides. The Divine kingdom as set forth in the Gospel was confessedly very different from the theory or the

practice of the papal autocracy; and they fearlessly appealed to the whole body of records of which the apostolic writings formed a part. In their eyes, as in those of the Teutonic reformers of a later day, the whole presented one uniform appearance, and exhibited the most complete, unbroken, indubitable harmony. Beneath this weapon the doctrine of papal supremacy, of absolute sacerdotalism, fell prostrate. With it Teutonic Christianity proceeded to liberate the human mind from the shackles which had cramped its energies and stunted its growth. It was not wonderful that they were unconscious of handling a two-edged sword; it was not wonderful that, when Teutonic nations were divided against themselves, the doctrine of submission to regal encroachments and arbitrary despotism was upheld on the authority of those scriptures from which its adversaries, as saints of God, derived the license to bind kings in chains and nobles with links of iron.

Latin Christianity had arisen on Augustine's doctrine of individual inspiration; it had proceeded to overlay that doctrine by a sacerdotal system, which virtually crushed it. To this same foundation Teutonic Christendom had reverted; but while it asserted strongly the independent operation of the Divine Spirit on each single soul, it asserted yet more strongly the existence of an authority external to the soul as stringent as the extremest developments of hierarchical supremacy. Still its position admitted a wider range of intellectual freedom; it was moreover one which at all times has been more successfully evaded in silence than assaulted with controversial violence. Under its sanction and by its influence the wonderful, if not wholly harmonious, fabric of Teutonic society has been raised; a new world of thought and literature has sprung up. The ideas of law and order have been invested with greater majesty, perhaps first been fully comprehended, and something more of the quickening and softening power of Christianity been revealed than under the palmiest times of Latin sacerdotalism. It has laid the foundations of civil as of spiritual liberty, it has defined more clearly the sources of national wealth and prosperity, has called into being many empires, has enfeebled and extinguished none. Amidst these and its countless other works and triumphs, partiality itself could scarcely deny that it has, by espousing some principles and repudiating others, raised barriers in the way of its own more rapid and more perfect development and acceptance. It has almost rejected by a rude negative the alliance of religion with art; it has scarcely attempted to solve a far more intricate and infinitely more momentous problem, — the relation of Christianity to philosophy.

By the former course it has rendered the cause of the Reformation permanently unpopular in Southern Europe. By the latter, it has converted into antagonists men from whose intellectual and moral strength it might have acquired no slight accession of force and power.

Here too the author has given us his thoughts and conclusions with great copiousness and perspicuity; but they are questions on which (although perhaps we might be disposed to take exception to some of his assertions), we can do no more than bestow a passing glance. They carry us back to the Pelagian and Iconoclastic controversies, and forward into the future of Teutonic Christianity; and as modern civilisation grows older, these questions must assuredly be invested with a more absorbing interest. The great religious movement which broke up the middle ages has already led, and must still further lead, to consequences not confined within the single province of theological belief. Art must continue to expand its inexhaustible resources, science develop new powers, philosophy explore with greater carefulness and earnestness the nature and object of human existence; nor will any appeal to traditional dogmas, or to prohibitions professing the sanction of Scripture, avail to arrest the inevitable course of modern thought. Christianity, art, moral philosophy, have gone on side by side, sometimes in alliance, sometimes in suppressed opposition, sometimes in open enmity. Side by side they will probably go on for no short period still.

It is our belief that, as time goes on, philosophy will more and more uphold the immediate operation of the Divine on the human spirit, will more and more enable men to imbibe, with its serene and tranquil wisdom, that zeal which has hitherto been too much associated with the maintenance of a controversial theology. The day is already past when men could divorce this zeal even from the field of natural science. When Bonaventure insisted both on the improbability and the folly of any one dying in support of geometrical truth, he never supposed that his words would be falsified in Galileo. (vi. 465.) It cannot be strange if ethical science should assume, over the heart as well as the mind, a yet more constraining power. But Christianity, and especially Teutonic Christianity, will less and less call for such martyrdoms. With whatever reluctance the admission may have been made, however vigorously it may, by some, be resisted still, Teutonic Christianity is based absolutely upon toleration (vi. 631.); and it is this fact which impels us to augur most hopefully for its future, which leads us to anticipate that it will not only less and less hold aloof from art, and from

physical or moral science, but will more peculiarly make them its own; that it will put down all incentives to superstition, not by rejecting art, but by cultivating its purest and highest ideas; that while it defines the province of human thought, it will not uphold that which contradicts universal moral principles; that it will find room for what is true, whether in Greek systems or in mediæval scholasticism, in the philosophy of Aristotle or of Butler. And in this its measured progress, it will embrace certain intellects and dispositions which hitherto it has chilled or repelled. By uniting the æsthetical with the moral development of man, it will bridge over the gulf which has severed the Italian mind from all sympathy with Teutonic Christendom. By showing itself fearless of scientific truth, it will attract many to whom Christian truth is as little, or as nothing. Some things on its outward surface it may have to put off, some of its positions it may have to reconsider; but that which has imparted to it life, that which sustains its strength, — the pure and living force of the teaching of Christ himself, — will be brought out into a clearer and more brilliant light, will be invested with a more sublime and heavenly majesty. Finally, it will show how human life may be conformed to that standard of the Christian Gospel, which is now virtually regarded as impractical and unattainable; how men in their international as in their individual and political relations, may be brought to bow beneath its yoke. In the words of the author's magnificent conclusion: 'Teutonic Christianity (and this seems to be its mission and its privilege), however nearly in its more perfect form it may already have approximated, may approximate still more closely to the absolute and perfect faith of Christ; it may discover and establish the sublime unison of religion and reason, keep in tune the triple-chorded harmony of faith, holiness, and charity; assert its own full freedom, respect the freedom of others. Christianity may yet have to exercise a far wider, even if more silent and untraceable influence, through its primary, all-penetrating, all-pervading principles, on the civilisation of mankind.'

- ART. III.—1. *An Appeal to the Scottish People, on the Improvement of their Scholastic and Academical Institutions.* By JOHN STUART BLACKIE, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Marischal College, Aberdeen. 1846.
2. *On the Advancement of Learning in Scotland: a Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Provost and Town Council of Edinburgh, Patrons of the University.* By JOHN STUART BLACKIE, Professor of Greek. 1855.
3. *Report of the Committee of the Faculty of Advocates on University Instruction in Law.* 1855.
4. *Inaugural Discourse delivered to the Graduates of King's College, Aberdeen, on his instillation as Lord Rector.* By JOHN INGLIS, LL.D., Dean of the Faculty of Advocates. 1857.
5. *Mittheilungen über das Unterrichtswesen Englands und Schottlands.* Von Dr. J. A. VOIGT. Halle: 1857.
6. *The historically received Conception of the University, considered with especial reference to Oxford.* By EDWARD KIRKPATRICK, M.A. 'Oxon: 1857.

THE feeling of dissatisfaction with the higher educational institutions of their country which now apparently pervades every class of Scotchmen, is of recent origin. Till within the last half dozen years, at the utmost, the adequacy of her five universities to supply the wants of Scotland, and their eminence, whether measured by an English or a continental standard, was rarely called in question by strangers, and would certainly have been maintained with characteristic fervour by almost every inhabitant of this part of our island.

Two Commissions of Visitation, it is true, had been issued, the first dated as early as 1826; and the fact of this mode of inquiry being again resorted to after a lapse of more than a hundred years, may in itself, perhaps, be regarded as a proof that, even in the earlier part of the century, all was not believed to be right. Still that something should be wrong was but human, and certainly did not show that the Scottish universities were an exception to the other institutions of this country.

In 1831 the Commissioners reported. They pointed out many and grave defects, and suggested numerous improvements

which commended themselves to the judgment of the very few persons of discernment who occupied themselves with the subject in Scotland and elsewhere. But their proposals were backed by no appreciable amount of public zeal, and in every case in which they had for their object anything beyond an increase of salary to the existing professors, were rather opposed than seconded by the professorial body. Over that body several illustrious names still shed a glory which was communicated to the universities themselves, and tended to dazzle the eyes both of Scotchmen and strangers, and to divert them from a calm and dispassionate scrutiny of the case submitted to them by the Commissioners. Whilst the youth of Scotland enjoyed the benefits which the presence and activity of such individuals conferred, grumbling on their part or on that of their guardians seemed like a species of national impiety; and all that was tangible in the matter resolved itself into a claim on the public for greater liberality towards certain of its servants,—a claim which was every year advanced with equal justice and more importunate clamour by almost every other body of officials, civil, military, and ecclesiastical. There was not an attaché to an embassy, paid or unpaid, a lieutenant in the navy, or a curate in England, who could not have submitted a more piteous case than that to which certain Professors in the University of Edinburgh ‘entreated’ the attention of Her Majesty’s Government.\* Their claim was neither recommended by an enlightened and generous solicitude for the interests of learning, nor was it supported by a strong and widespread feeling that, as individuals, they had been the victims of public injustice; and the consequence was that over their ‘entreaties’ and their sorrows, which latter in truth were not altogether imaginary, the waves of a busy and heedless world were permitted to pass.

Thus the question rested for twenty years, till towards the commencement of the present decade it was again resumed by different individuals, with different motives, and from another point of view. The proposals for improving the Scottish universities, in which the present movement had its beginnings, proceeded, it seems, from a few individuals who had completed their studies either in England or in Germany. Their suggestions were derived not from the Report of the Scottish Com-

---

\* Memorial to the Earl of Aberdeen, &c., by a Committee appointed by the Senatus Academicus of the University of Edinburgh to ‘entreat the attention of Her Majesty’s advisers to the present ‘state of the endowments in that University.’



missioners, but from what they themselves had witnessed in the ancient University of Oxford, or in the comparatively modern ones of Berlin and Bonn. The watchword which they adopted was not Reform, but 'Extension.' Whatever was there they were willing to retain and anxious to invigorate; but at the same time they made no secret of the fact that, in their opinion, with the best possible arrangements, and even with the most liberal endowments, the staff and the machinery of the Scottish universities are inadequate, in quality still more than in quantity, to discharge the duties which an advancing civilisation exacts. They told their countrymen that if the preliminary course of languages and mathematics is to be retained, it must no longer remain on the footing of an ill-taught school, but that its starting point must be raised by an entrance examination, and thoroughness and precision communicated to it by grafting the tutorial system of England on the professorial system which was indigenous in Scotland. They told them, moreover, that if the teaching of the universities is to aim, not at commencing the scientific studies of boys, but at completing the scientific studies of men (in so far at least as study can ever be completed under the guidance of others), this must be accomplished by furnishing the means of carrying every branch of knowledge up to the highest point which it had attained by the investigations either of their own or of former generations. Finally, they endeavoured to impress upon them the fact, that not only every progressive community, but every active school of learning, must at the same time be an arena of discovery—a field of enterprise and advancement; that the sciences can be truly appreciated only where they are seen in the process of growth, in the very act of development; and that for this purpose the university must gather around it those whose most prominent function should be, not the transmission, but the pursuit of truth. No positive scheme was proposed in the first instance, for it was felt that to descend to particulars in the stage at which the discussion then stood was only to court opposition, and to withdraw the attention of the public from those wider views with which they were so little familiar, and the full and accurate possession of which was the only safe guide for action when the period for action should arrive.

• Scarcely had these discussions passed the preliminary stage which we have indicated, and begun to assume the more tangible form of national questions,—to which, however, no satisfactory answers could yet be given,—when suddenly, to the surprise

of every one, the whole subject assumed a new and more pressing aspect. The period for action was forced on by an external event, altogether unforeseen when the condition of the higher educational institutions of Scotland began to be canvassed on their own merits, and with a view to Scottish wants and interests. The Indian Civil Service was thrown open to competition, and, at the very first trial, those candidates who had been educated in Scotland failed egregiously. The effect of this single occurrence was infinitely greater than all the appeals which had been made to national pride, and all the arguments which had been derived from the intrinsic value of knowledge. Of the many benefits which, now admittedly, the Union of the kingdoms had conferred on Scotchmen, the connexion which it opened to them with the East India Company was the most unquestionable. Many a snug mansion house which now nestles amid ancestral trees had been founded; many an acre that waves with yellow corn had been reclaimed; many a hill, and dale, and moor, and mountain had been purchased, with the rupees which were poured out of that horn of plenty. Small wonder then that the alternative which was placed before the people of Scotland, either of renouncing for their children the highest and most lucrative branch of this coveted service, or of improving their educational institutions, should have given cause for little hesitation.

Those who had been most heedless at the time now remembered, with bitter and unavailing regret, when they saw their sons returning empty-handed from this contest for the prizes of life, that ten years before Professor Blackie had told them that 'The academical institutions of Scotland, in point of scientific and literary elevation, by the admission of all who know anything about these matters, *stand at the lowest grade known in Europe*; were, in fact, in many of their classes, no *universities* at all, in the sense in which that word is generally understood, but mere *schools*, and schools of a very bad, irregular, and inefficient description;' and that, in saying so, he reminded them that he but repeated 'the evidence given by the professors in person before the University Commission of 1826.'

With one bound the question of Scottish University Reform passed from the first to the second stage of its existence. Now that the general public was linked to their cause by the very efficacious, if not very lofty motive which we have mentioned, the hands of the University Reformers of Scotland gained strength from day to day; and though a question which, in its primary bearings at all events, affected the interests of the

middle and higher classes only, was not even now discussed with the zeal and warmth with which popular movements of far less importance are advocated and opposed, it began to assume the aspect of a subject of great national interest. The Earl of Elgin, as the most prominent Scotchman of liberal tendencies unconnected with Government, became the president, as Lord Campbell has since become a leading member, of an association which had been formed some years before for the purpose of pressing the subject on public attention; and the Lord Advocate announced to his constituents at the general election in April that he had prepared a Bill, which he proposed to submit to Parliament on the earliest fitting occasion, and which, but for the dissolution, would have been already introduced. The last Parliamentary session was too short, and too much occupied with measures of immediate urgency, to admit of the question receiving that attention which its great importance and difficulty called for, and the Lord Advocate has wisely deferred his measure till the Session of Parliament, now about to be resumed.

We trust that this brief retrospect will serve the purpose of placing our English readers on a level with the Scotch University question in its present stage. To most Englishmen we are aware that farther information will be requisite in order to enable them to form, for themselves, opinions on a subject which every one must see is far from being exclusively of Scottish interest. But before entering more closely either into the existing condition of the Scottish universities, or the means by which their improvement may be effected, we conceive it to be our duty to point out some of the dangers to which the discussion is exposed from the peculiarity of the circumstances in which it has arisen.

On the adoption of the Indian Civil Service examination, as we have said, apathy and indifference to the condition of the higher educational institutions of Scotland was succeeded on the part of the middle classes by a restless impatience for action in one direction. Up to this point the danger which threatened University Reform was, that nothing would be done; since then the danger has been rather that something will be done wrong. The action now so generally called for is invoked by many, we fear, rather as a means of escaping a present inconvenience, than from a sense of the vast importance of the institutions by which a whole people is to receive its highest instruction in wisdom, and its loftiest incentives to virtue. That Scotchmen should go to India now through the portal of an examination in Latin, Greek, and mathematics, as safely

and as surely as they had done heretofore through the kind offices of fathers, uncles, and cousins once removed, is an important matter to many persons unquestionably; and he would be forgetful indeed of the great names which they have contributed to our Indian annals, and the credit they have shed on every department of the public service in the East, who should wish them to be excluded from any portion of a field of activity in which they may earn similar distinctions. But important as this object is, it is very far from being the most important end that the universities of Scotland have to propose to themselves; and any measure of reform arising out of it, or which should have it exclusively, or even mainly, in view, would be paltry and one-sided.

The professions in this country, and not the civil service in India, are the proper objects of our national universities, both Scotch and English; and it is only in so far as this service falls within the category of the professions that the universities can deal with it at all. That in our opinion it does so fall to a certain extent will be obvious when we explain that we here use the term *profession* in a wider sense than that which is commonly given to it. We include under it, of course, the whole of the recognised and traditionary forms in which one member of a civilised community undertakes mental labour in behalf of another. But we include a great deal more than this. The professions, one and all, have a public as well as a private, a general as well as a special side, and they have permanent and eternal, as well as transitory and ephemeral objects. The individual who devotes himself to a profession may take the interests of his fellow-men collectively as well as singly for his object; and he may deal with them apart from the circumstances in which they exhibit themselves in a particular time and country, as well as in conjunction with these circumstances. In taking possession of this higher and wider point of view, he very possibly steps beyond his profession as a private calling. If the lawyer adopts the public for his client, he becomes a statesman, if mankind in the abstract, he becomes a philosopher. But he does not cease to be professional, in the sense in which we here understand the term, and in which we believe a university of learning should understand a profession. On the contrary, it is in the presence of something like this absolute manner of regarding it, quite as much as in the nature of the occupation itself, that the distinction between a profession and a trade consists, and it is in communicating this, the properly speaking professional, as opposed to the mercantile habit of mind, that the university finds her highest and most essential vocation. But if

the university relinquishes her academical character in one direction by condescending to impart mere practical skill, she does so not less flagrantly when she undertakes to convey mere general knowledge and accomplishment. It is essential to her usefulness that she shall not confine herself to storing the memory with isolated facts. The knowledge which she imparts must not only be knowledge which from its intrinsic value and importance may possibly be serviceable in some sphere of life not yet entered upon, or in some course of specific study not yet embraced; but knowledge, the value and importance of which is at once made apparent from the relation in which it is placed to some specific central idea; and this central idea, for reasons which we shall explain more fully hereafter, can be none other than that which lies at the root of one or other of the professions. It is in the more specific value thus communicated to the subjects with which she deals that the main distinction between the University and the School consists; and where this is overlooked, the University not only neglects her proper vocation, but enters into competition with a rival with whom she necessarily contends under the greatest disadvantages.\*

The people of Scotland were not mistaken when they accepted the result of the Indian Examination as a proof of the defective condition of the universities. But, in so far as this matter was concerned, at all events, *the Universities were defective mainly in consequence of the defects of the Schools.* The wrongs which neglect and indifference had inflicted on the schools, became first apparent and notorious in their effects on the universities; and so intimately are the two bound together, that we are persuaded they will be wrongs without remedies so long as the reforms now contemplated are confined exclusively to either. Accurate scholarship is a commodity which cannot be manufactured at an university, and neither the tutorial system nor the professorial system will qualify the raw recruits, who crowd the benches of the Scotch colleges, to encounter the disciplined troops who are indebted for far the most important part of their drill, not to the universities but to the schools of England. By no scheme of reform, however cunningly devised, can any institutions whatever, call them by what name you choose, perform the functions at once of universities and

---

\* In his observations on the necessity, for University purposes, of what he has happily designated a 'solar study,' Mr. Kirkpatrick has brought out the distinction for which we here contend, more clearly than any former writer with whom we are acquainted, in English at least.

collegiate schools ; and still it is of this hopeless and impossible result that those persons are in search who, whilst they would retain the name and external arrangements of an university, seem to value it chiefly as a place of preparation for an examination which, in its most prominent characteristics, is scholastic rather than academic. Let an entrance examination, not extravagantly high, but at the same time not contemptibly and ludicrously low (as is the case with that at present in force in Edinburgh), be at once placed at the threshold of the universities, and their academic character will be preserved to them ; the reforms which may then be introduced will satisfy the expectations of those who have the intellectual interests and character of Scotland most at heart, and the burgh schoolmasters, being immediate gainers by the measure, will use their best endeavours, we doubt not, to raise the character of their instruction to meet the demand.

There is not a burgh school in Scotland in which the learned languages and the mathematics are not taught, and taught in very many instances by persons whose chief, if not their only, grievance is that their pupils are drafted off to the universities before they have received the full benefit of their instructions.\* To such persons, even though no increase of salary were granted them, an entrance examination at the universities, which would have the effect of leaving the most promising and interesting of their pupils in their hands for a couple of years longer, would be an incalculable boon. Their own scholarship would be elevated by the fact of their being thus furnished with an opportunity of conducting the studies of more advanced youths, their offices would rise in dignity and public estimation as well as in emolument, and would very soon become objects of ambition to a higher class of men than those by whom in many cases they are held at present. We are quite aware of the fact that the burgh schoolmasters of Scotland are so wretchedly remunerated as to render it altogether out of the question, whilst they remain on their present footing, that their offices should be coveted by

---

\* In their General Report the Commissioners say (p. 29.), that ample opportunities for preparing for the second Latin and Greek classes exist in Edinburgh, and that they are 'led from the evidence 'to anticipate that they will soon be found in every town of any 'consequence, and in many of the parish schools in Scotland.' The proposal of the Commissioners was simply to abolish the junior classes of Latin and Greek. For many reasons we should prefer an entrance examination.

men of ability and learning; and there is no measure which we would more earnestly press on the consideration of the people, and more particularly on the town councils of Scotland, than an increase to these endowments.\* But we see no reason why an arrangement which would benefit every one of them more or less, *and benefit the most efficient of them most*, should be delayed till the whole class is put on a different footing.

What then, our readers may well ask, is the reason for delaying a measure which would benefit the universities, which would benefit the schools, which would strike at the source of the difficulty regarding the Indian Examination, which would cost no public money, and by which apparently everybody would gain and nobody would lose?

There are two reasons which sufficiently explain, if they do not justify, the opposition hitherto successfully offered to entrance examinations at the Scottish universities, and in the cases in which they have been introduced, these causes have speedily reduced them to the emptiest forms.

1st. The chairs of Latin, Greek and Mathematics are for the most part but slenderly endowed, and the professors consequently are dependent for their remuneration in a great measure on fees paid by the students. An entrance examination, it is supposed, would diminish the attendance and consequently reduce the value, of the classes, and hence it has usually experienced the bitterest opposition from the holders of these chairs.† An increased allowance from Government to the few individuals liable to be thus affected, would at once remove this ground of opposition, and, had the learned pro-

---

\* The rector of the High School of Edinburgh, who is the highest official of this class in Scotland, has a salary of 200*l.*, and his whole emoluments amount to about 500*l.* In Glasgow the rector of the High School has no salary at all; whilst in Aberdeen, where he has to prepare pupils for *two* universities, he has only 100*l.*! In some of the provincial towns the evil is still more outrageous, the emoluments from pupils being necessarily insignificant. The rector of the Burgh School of Stirling, who, we understand, is a scholar of the highest attainments, has a salary of 60*l.*, and receives *in all* 120*l.* Some of the minor arrangements of these schools also call urgently for reform. In the High School of Edinburgh the writing-master is paid more highly than the rector or any of the classical teachers; and an hour a day for *six years* is frequently devoted to the acquisition of this mechanical accomplishment!

† The Commissioners state that the objections of the professors to this and similar proposals when made by them, were 'rested distinctly 'on their supposed tendency to affect the incomes of the existing 'professors.' (*Report*, p. 3.)

fessors whom we previously mentioned, coupled their claims on public liberality with a proposal so manifestly beneficial to the public though injurious to themselves, their whole case would have been listened to with far greater attention.

2. There is a notion which we regard as utterly foolish and irrational, but which nevertheless is very prevalent in Scotland, to the effect that, for the sake of the poorer class of students, it ought to be *possible* to pass at once from the parish schools to the university, without going through the intermediate training of the burgh schools at all. At the parish schools, to their credit be it said, a little Latin is very commonly taught, but no Greek whatever; and the consequence is, that at all the universities a class exists in which the teaching of this language is taken up from the alphabet. The adoption of an entrance-examination would no doubt remove this stepping stone, and render the direct passage from the parish schools to the universities impossible in any other than the unusual cases where individual effort had rendered all external appliances of comparative indifference. But is this, we would ask, not precisely the result that is most desirable? Cases that are clearly exceptional will provide for themselves without our solicitude, and we shall not greatly marvel if some Scottish shepherd boy passes from his native hill side to a Collectorship or a Residency in India, as Livingstone qualified himself for his missionary labours and for foreign travel, without the intervention either of school or university, either good or bad. Neither will it surprise us to hear that there are exceptional parish schoolmasters in Scotland qualified in a very high degree to prepare their pupils for the Scotch or any other universities. But as it is with the ordinary results of schooling, so it is with the ordinary school alone that we are here concerned; and our conviction is, that as a general rule, it is neither possible, *nor desirable*, that the parish schools should be raised to a position in which they can successfully perform this task. An organisation and arrangements fitted for that purpose would be unfitted for the function which properly is theirs, and to the importance of the office which belongs to the lower schools, at all events, we are proud to think that the present generation of our countrymen is fully alive. Nor can we see the hardship, even in the case of that very deserving class of persons who are the objects of so much sympathy, in their being compelled to acquire the rudiments of the learned languages at the nearest burgh school, rather than at one of the universities. The thing would be done more thoroughly, more cheaply, more quickly, and (by the simple arrangement of the rector or head of the school



having a separate class for persons advanced in life) more agreeably, than at the university, where, even as matters stand at present, a person who has received no learned training at all cannot but feel that he is in a false position, and where, even under a change of system, he would be apt to be regarded by the most long-suffering of tutors as an obstruction and a nuisance.

The only objection to an entrance examination which has any real substance in it is the diminution which it would cause in the emoluments of the professors of Latin, Greek, and possibly of mathematics; and that objection we hope to see removed by a liberal recognition of their claims in the promised measure of the Lord Advocate. We are persuaded that we are speaking in the truest interests of the universities, and recommending the only course by which Scotchmen can hope to compete successfully with their fellow-countrymen in examinations which are already extensively introduced into almost every branch of the Civil Service, when, as the true basis of university reform in Scotland, we urge an entrance examination and a corresponding improvement in what in France would be called the secondary instruction. We have been the more anxious that there should be no mistake about our sentiments on this point, because we have observed that pretty nearly all the opposition which has been offered to the proposals of the more progressive portion of university reformers in Scotland has proceeded from a hazy and puzzle-headed notion, that somehow or other the work which the schools left imperfect should be completed by the universities, and that every suggestion which did not appear to point in that direction was (hated characteristics) speculative and theoretical. Let the burgh schools of Scotland receive adequate support and encouragement, and in return we doubt not that in a very few years they will do their own work, and bear their own burden. When this is accomplished, it will be seen that proposals for the reform of the universities, which are dictated by a lofty conception of the absolute grandeur of science, and enlightened by an acquaintance with the experience of mankind in other countries and other times, are not less *practical* than the most abject and benighted scrambling after a back door of escape from impending pecuniary loss.

Should the resolution to adopt a *bonâ fide* entrance examination be finally adopted, several matters of detail of very great importance will fall to be considered.

1. What shall be the nature and extent of the examination at first; and to what point shall it ultimately be raised, should its existence produce the effects which we anticipate on the teaching of the burgh schools?

2. By whom shall it be conducted? by professors or schoolmasters, or examiners appointed by Government, or by all or any of them in conjunction with the others?

3. Where shall it take place; at departure from the school as in Prussia, or on arrival at the university as in England?

On these questions, important though we deem them, it is not our intention to enter at present. The proper occasion for their discussion will arise when the Government measure is submitted to our criticism, and when the battle for the general principles of a liberal and enlightened reform has been won.

When, passing over the barrier which we thus propose to erect on the threshold of academic life, we turn our attention to the Faculty of Arts, as it is exhibited either in the existing Universities of this and other countries, or in the idea of a university, as it has been gradually worked out for us by the thought and experience of former times, the first question which presents itself is this: is it a Faculty in the sense in which that term is applied to the Faculties of Divinity, Law, and Medicine, that is to say, a course of study which, in so far as theory is concerned at all events, arms the student for the duties of a calling, and enables him to take his place in society, and thus constitutes an end in itself; or is it a means simply, introductory, and perhaps auxiliary to all the professions, but leading in itself to nothing more definite than that general intellectual training of which every cultivated member of a refined society, equally with the professional man, stands in need? Are its objects <sup>\*</sup>special or general, professional or non-professional?

On the Continent the question has been answered by the adoption of the former of these alternatives; in England and Scotland by the adoption of the latter; and the two answers thus given are the two horns of a practical dilemma on which not a few of those who have legislated and those who have reasoned on the subject have been tossed, from the Middle Ages to the present time. Either alternative, if adopted in its integrity, furnishes a perfectly definite course of action, but a course of action, involving sacrifices to which neither party has been willing to resign itself; and the consequence in both cases has been a series of compromises which would have been less hurtful if they had been more openly acknowledged. The Continental theory, which has received its most complete realisation in Germany, relegates the course of general study to the gymnasia altogether, and in so doing involves inconveniences for which its many advantages are by no means an adequate compensation. The English theory again sacrifices learning *as a profession*

entirely, and has thus been in no small degree the cause of the gravest defect which mars the social organisation of our country. Why have we in England no 'learned class'? is a question which we sometimes ask ourselves, and which our continental neighbours ask us more frequently, in a tone not very gratifying to those feelings of self-satisfaction for which we are nationally notorious. The reason is to be found in the very undeniable fact that in our highest educational institutions *we regard learning always as a means, never as an end*\*; and though exceptional individuals may ultimately adopt it as a vocation, no one is trained to it as the business of life. To those persons who continue their residence at the English universities after they have taken their degrees, who become teachers in the great collegiate schools of England, or who obtain preferments in the Church without parochial duties, philology, philosophy, literature, or the mathematics may become permanent callings. But even in their case they are callings for which it was scarcely the design of the university to prepare them. Still to some extent the result is attained, and whilst such is the case its attainment by indirect and unintentional, in place of direct and preconceived means, is too much in keeping with the whole scheme of English life to render it as objectionable as it would elsewhere be considered. But in Scotland,—where no one continues to reside at the universities, except the professors, where the burgh schools are not in a condition to offer either a scholarly occupation or a gentlemanly subsistence, where there are no preferments in the Church which do not involve very heavy parochial duties, or in the Law to which judicial functions are not attached,—the indirect means of calling a learned class into existence, and of supporting it, are as deficient as the direct means of training it are defective; and the consequence is that this, the highest of all the professions, is literally and absolutely non-existent. We have already hinted that these objections to the theory of the Faculty of Arts, which has received exclusive acceptance in England, are not in our opinion fatal to it to the extent of driving us into the opposite alternative; and this opinion, as we shall explain presently, rests upon the belief that they are by no means inseparable from it, at least in a modified form.

---

\* Dr. Voigt, in his very interesting book on the educational institutions of England and Scotland, — '*Unterrichtswesen Englands und Schottlands*,' — mentions this unworthy feature in our national character as, in his opinion, lying at the root of all that is defective in our educational system.

In our opinion no apology for the existence of the propædæutic course within academic walls is demanded, even on the part of those who hold, in the strictest sense, the necessity of a distinction in principle between the highest and all the other forms of instruction. Their argument is founded on the principle that in every complete system of education, every stage of human life which is distinctly marked off must receive its appropriate training. The soundness of this principle being granted them, they point to the undeniable fact that boyhood and manhood constitute two such stages; and we at once acknowledge that, to them, its applicability is incontrovertible. The historical deduction, by which it is shown by Mr. Kirkpatrick to have descended to us from the schools of the Sophists, is important as confirming experimentally a result we had arrived at by other means. But the principle, it is manifest, comes equally into play in every other instance in which a similar fact can be established; and if youth be a stage of human life marked off from boyhood on the one hand and manhood on the other, then for it also a distinct and appropriate training is indispensable. The question thus reduces itself simply to an 'issue in fact.' If youth be a separate stage of life, then the propædæutic course, the *ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα*, the trivium, quadrivium, or curriculum of Arts, stands rooted in the principle which underlies the whole arrangement as firmly as the drill of the soldier, or the professional training of the man.

Now, the existence or non-existence of the fact can be established only by an appeal to the experience of mankind. If the historical test be adopted, we have already seen that the response is in the affirmative; for the propædæutic is as old as the more strictly academic portions of the educational system. What, then, say personal experience and observation? Are we not each of us conscious of having passed in his own case, and have we not observed that others have passed, and do pass invariably, through such a stage, — more or less protracted according to individual idiosyncrasy, but in all cases stretching over several years? Is not this stage marked by the rise of powers and faculties of mind and body which, though immature they be, render the intellectual as well as the moral and physical restraints of boyhood nothing but impediments to progress. Simultaneously with the longing for freedom the consciousness of responsibility has arisen, and the will for the future acknowledges no other allegiance than that which it owes to the monitor within. The understanding and the reason are at work on the causes of things, and the memory, with its stores of objective truth, retreats into the background. But the power of self-guidance is

not at once accompanied by a clear perception of the direction which the reciprocal action of internal dispositions and external circumstances will assign to the future life. The individual himself, and the working world which surrounds him, are as yet two vast enigmas; and they are enigmas which no one else can solve for him, because though the answers to them may be similar for many men, in no two cases are the processes identical by which these answers can alone be arrived at. If the preliminary course of study promised no other advantage than that of affording the time, opportunity, and information necessary for enabling the individual to select his life-study for himself, in place of having it chosen for him by another, we hold that its claims to a separate and permanent place in every system of education would be sufficiently established.

In proposing to retain the general course of preliminary study, whilst at the same time we assent to the doctrine which makes a professional centre the indispensable condition of all proper academic study, we manifestly assign a double function to the Faculty of Arts; and this we do designedly as the result of the most careful consideration which we have been able to bestow on the subject. The one branch of its office falls to it in virtue of the peculiarities attaching to that most momentous and interesting stage of human life of which we have just spoken; the other is imposed in the name of human progress itself in every form and at every stage. On the one hand it is the vestibule to all the faculties, on the other it is itself the faculty which has abstract learning for its object. In the one department its character is only semi-academic, in the other it is academic, and as such professional, in the fullest and strictest sense.

Nor is it at all difficult, even in the case of the Scottish universities, where the Faculty of Arts in this latter sense has been non-existent, and where the terms 'Faculty' and 'Curriculum' have consequently been used as synonymous, to sketch out the arrangements by which this double function may be given to it.

The field which is traversed by the *curriculum* at present we would retain unaltered. It embraces the learned languages, including the literature, antiquities, and, to a certain extent, the political history of the two great races of antiquity, logic, mathematics, ethics, and physics; the two latter being known in Scotland by the not inappropriate names of moral and natural philosophy. Though sufficiently, and, if the subjects were dealt with in a high sense, perhaps alarmingly, extensive, it is not more so we believe than is necessary for the purposes of a complete scien-

tific conspectus. All such subjects, however, as natural history, chemistry, rhetoric, civil history, modern literature—in short, every thing not absolutely necessary for the object in view, we should decidedly leave for the professional department. To crowd them into the general course, and enforce them on all, would be merely to produce superficiality, and give an air of dilettantism to the labours both of teachers and pupils. By thus restricting it, so to speak, to these cardinal points, and by cutting off the two junior classes of languages from its commencement, which would be the immediate effect of an entrance examination, we see no reason why the curriculum of Arts should not be accomplished in Scotland, as it is in England, in three in place of four years. In this case the difficulty of imposing it, with the attendant degree, as an indispensable preliminary to all the professions, would be considerably diminished, and the propriety of its being so imposed without a single exception we would urge in the strongest manner.

The name to be given to the degree which should follow on this three years' curriculum is a matter of no great moment. That of Bachelor of Arts would unquestionably be most in keeping with historical usage, reserving that of Master for the termination of the professional course. In any case, however, the standard of scholarship required as the result of the curriculum ought not to be lower than that which is guaranteed by the degree of B.A. at an English university.

In addition to the entrance examination, which, by raising the starting point of the curriculum, would do much to elevate its goal also, there are two measures, by the joint action of which we feel no hesitation in saying that Scottish scholarship might in a very few years be placed on a level with that of England.

Public opinion in Scotland has called so emphatically for the introduction of the tutorial system since the adoption of the Indian Civil Service Examination, that we cannot doubt that the Lord Advocate's Bill will deal with it, whatever its other provisions may be. And in this matter, for our own part, we entirely go along with the prevailing opinion. We cannot but regard the adoption of the professorial system, and still more its exclusive adoption in the *curriculum* of Arts, as having been an error in the constitution of the Scottish universities from first to last. The marvel is not that its results should prove unsatisfactory now, but that it should have borne fruits that rendered it tolerable so long.

In saying this we have no desire to depreciate the value of lecturing in its proper place; and that place we take to be the professional faculties. What the student stands in need of there

is stimulus, direction, and suggestion, more than positive teaching; and the most successful mode of treatment will be that which communicates the habit of self-help in labour, and self-reliance in speculation, the faculty of doing not *what* but *as* others have done. When this is to be accomplished, it is not the industry of the teacher, or the time and trouble he expends on his pupils, that constitutes his value, but his gifts; it is not the quantity of his teaching, but the quality of it that is important. If he is to teach others to walk alone in the field of science, he must himself be strong, independent, original. If he is to sow the seeds of progress, he must exhibit the phenomena of growth. Even in the professional faculties we have reason to know that the want of those means of acting directly on the mind and character of the student which personal contact with a mind and character matured in the career on which he is entering alone can give, are severely felt where the professorial system prevails. The gradation of ranks in the professorial office which obtains in Germany, does much to obviate this objection; the junior professors (*professores extraordinarii*, and *privatim docentes*) being naturally more accessible to the students than the regular ordinary professors, who for the most part are the most prominent representatives of their respective subjects which the country contains. We are very decidedly of opinion that it might be further obviated by a recurrence in Scotland to the system of residence in common, and by the contact to which such residence would naturally give rise. With these modifications, or perhaps even without them, we believe that for the professional faculties it is infinitely to be preferred to any form of the tutorial system, and this opinion certainly finds the strongest confirmation in the fruits which it has borne in Germany during the present century. But all the arguments which may be urged in its favour when applied to the professional faculties in Germany, fall to the ground when it is transferred in Scotland to the curriculum of the Faculty of Arts. No man supposes that the instruction in the gymnasium, which is the root of all the accurate scholarship of Germany, is conveyed by means of lectures, and still this would be necessary to render the German practice the slightest justification for that of Scotland. Where a language is to be taught for its own sake, it must be practised, and this indispensable requisite has banished lecturing in everything but the name from the classes of Latin and Greek even in Scotland. In these classes, then, at all events, let it be formally and avowedly abandoned, except as an occasional excursion into the

wider fields of the literary history, social life, and modes of speculative thought of the nations of antiquity. Lectures delivered in this sense by the professor once or twice a week might become a reality; and would form, as it seems to us, his appropriate contribution to the teaching of the curriculum of Arts. Let the daily work of tuition, on the other hand, be entrusted to tutors, more or less numerous according to the size of the classes, but in every case sufficiently so to enable each to make the personal acquaintance of every one of his pupils. These he would, of course, divide into sections, and read with them at separate hours; and we are persuaded that the thoroughness of the work would in a great measure depend on the arrangement being such as to prevent more than a dozen or fifteen persons ever being present at the same hour. The semi-academical character of the teaching is kept up by the conversational tone which naturally prevails in so small an assemblage, and whilst subjects of the highest and widest speculation are introduced and discussed, the tutor has an opportunity of seeing that the wits of his auditors are not sent a wool-gathering, as is too frequently the case when such subjects are introduced to them for the first time from the professorial 'throne.' But it is unnecessary that we should argue in favour of a system of the advantages of which we believe the people of Scotland at the present day are thoroughly aware, though it is curious to remark that twenty years ago the Commissioners reported against it without a dissenting voice.

The only other alteration which seems called for in the curriculum is the extension of the session from six, or rather practically from little more than five months, as at present, to nine. We can see no possible reason why the winter session should not be followed in this department, as in the Medical Faculty, by a summer attendance of three months. By this simple arrangement the period of actual residence at the university during the three years' course we have proposed, would be greater than during the four years over which it at present extends. The long vacation of six months, which in the case of advanced students may have the advantage of fostering habits of self-reliance and independent labour, of affording time for travel at the period of life when its liberalising effects are greatest, and in many other ways may be turned to account, is to immature lads simply a waste of time.\*

---

\* See the recommendations of the Commissioners. General Report, p. 38.; and Report on St. Andrew's, p. 19.



We have already said that the proper business of the Faculty of Arts, not less than of the other faculties, is to afford the means of preparation for the exercise of a profession, and that this profession is none other than that of abstract learning in all its departments.

We shall now endeavour to explain the arrangements by which we believe this object may be attained without seriously interfering with the constitution of the Scottish universities as they at present exist.

As the highest department of teaching, the professional department will fall necessarily to the share of the highest class of teachers in the Faculty of Arts, that is to the professors as opposed to the tutors. Further, in so far as the branches of learning to be dealt with belong to their respective departments, the duty of dealing with them will fall to the existing professors. In the present professorial staff, then, we have at once a nucleus for the professional department of the Faculty of Arts. Nor is this arrangement one to which we should suppose the professors at all events would be likely to object. If the main burden of teaching in the curriculum is to be handed over to tutors, endowed by Government, under the provisions of the Lord Advocate's Bill (and we can see no other issue to that matter), and if the fees of the students are to flow into the pockets of the professors as at present (which is the arrangement we contemplate \*) we cannot imagine that they should object to undertake duties at once more dignified and less laborious than those which they now discharge.

But in every university in which the Faculty of Arts has been placed on a professional footing, departments of study are represented which do not belong to the Curriculum of Arts, and which we do not propose to add to it. Some of these,—such for example as belong to physical science,—already exist in the Scottish universities, in more or less intimate connexion with the Faculty of Medicine. Others, such as Civil History and Political Economy, exist only in name, whilst in theory they seem to fluctuate between the Faculties of Law and Arts. All these must be formally admitted into the pro-

---

\* The Royal Commissioners were less generous. They recommended that in Edinburgh and Glasgow the professors of Latin and Greek hereafter appointed should each have an assistant, and that these assistants should receive such remuneration from the emoluments of the professor as might be fixed by the University Court. (*General Report*, p. 34.)

fessional department of the Faculty of Arts, *without being thereby dissevered from the other faculties to which they have a natural or conventional affinity.* Wherever, on the contrary, there are branches which are not represented in the existing universities at all, and which are yet indispensable to a complete organisation of a professional Faculty of Arts, these must of course be made the subjects of new endowments. Whether the true interests of the public will be better served by these endowments being at once provided out of the national funds, or by leaving them to be supplied by the chance liberality of private individuals during an indefinite future, is a question which we shall not presume to answer. Neither shall we venture to mention the subjects, which in our opinion merit to be thus represented. Such an enumeration, in the present state of information in this country, could give rise to nothing but irrelevant observations, of which during the discussion of the University question in Scotland the correspondents of the newspapers have already exhibited many flagrant specimens. What the subjects are which are thus represented in Germany and in France can be learned from more than one of the publications which we have placed at the head of this article. But whether the branches thus represented were numerous as in Germany, or few as in Scotland they must for some time continue to be, it is not of course our meaning that in offering himself as a candidate for the professional degree in the Faculty of Arts any student should be called upon to profess the whole of them. At this stage of his studies, where, above all, the errors of the polymathia (*vielwisserei*) are to be avoided, he would not only be allowed but *required* to select one of the leading departments. Suppose him to fix on Classical Philology or Mental Philosophy,—whilst his examination would embrace every subject which could directly throw light on these branches, natural science, as bearing on them only indirectly, would either be passed over very slightly, or wholly omitted, on the understanding that during his curriculum he had already acquired a sufficient knowledge of it for his purposes. The converse of this would of course be the case in the event of his selecting Natural Science as his forte. A similar rule would be followed even in subjects not so distinctly marked off as those we have mentioned. Suppose Modern History to be chosen, the examination in classical philology, though by no means omitted, would not be of so minute a kind as if that department, or even Ancient History had been professed. The system which we have here indicated

is that which is followed in conferring the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Germany; and whatever we may think of German customs in other respects, this one unquestionably is deserving of imitation wherever anything beyond 'smattering' is aimed at.

But there is another matter connected with this subject which will not be so easily dealt with in Scotland. Whence, it will reasonably be asked, are students to be obtained for a professional faculty of learning in a country where there are so few learned appointments as in Scotland? In this respect Scotland manifestly labours under great disadvantages as compared with England; still even in Scotland we can see means of escape from the difficulty partly immediate, partly prospective.

*First.* If the tutorships which we have suggested are endowed in the curriculum of the Faculty of Arts, these will form the first step of promotion to those persons who devote themselves to this profession; for we take it for granted that to this office none would then be appointed who had not taken the professional degree in the Faculty of Arts.

*Second.* The adoption of an entrance examination at the universities would, we hope, at no distant time render the higher positions in the burgh schools objects of moderate ambition to persons of the same class.

*Third.* As regards the professorships, for reasons which we formerly explained, no regulation as to training ought absolutely to exclude persons of unusual natural gifts. As a general rule, however, the professorships in the Faculty of Arts ought in future to be reserved for those who had availed themselves of the full training which its professional department afforded in the subject which they aspired to teach, in place of being conferred, as at present, on any member of the other professions who may have chanced to devote his leisure to its cultivation. If these appointments were increased in number to the extent of rendering the professional department of the faculty anything like complete, they would probably supply in Scotland, as they do in Germany, an adequate stimulus to the cultivation of learning.

*Fourth.* The simple fact of the degree to follow on the termination of the professional course being recognised as the highest guarantee for a learned training, would render it an object of ambition, and this department would consequently be attended by a considerable number of youths of the best class who were desirous of cultivating the more abstract departments

of the other professions, or who wished to enter public life with the highest educational prestige.\*

From these various sources we believe that a supply of students might be reckoned on, not altogether insignificant even in the first instance, and certain to increase from year to year.

As the Professional Faculties, commonly so called, already possess the character which we have suggested as indispensable to the proper working of the Faculty of Arts, we have no observations to make on them in point of principle, and shall proceed at once to offer a very few hints for their more efficient practical organisation.

It is well known that few if any of the universities which have held the most prominent places in the history of human progress have been equally distinguished for all the departments of learning at the same time. Athens was a school of philosophy, but never possessed what we are accustomed to regard as the professional faculties. Constantinople, Alexandria, and Paris were great schools of theology, but not of law. Rome, Berytus, and Bologna were schools of law, at first exclusively, and always pre-eminently. Some of the smaller French universities, such as Orleans and Montpellier, were even prohibited from teaching theology altogether lest they should become rivals to Paris. Everywhere, in short, the maxim *non omnes omnia* was held to be as true of universities as we know it to be of individuals, and a 'solar study' as indispensable to the whole as to each of its members; and this fact we think it important to keep in mind in suggesting improvements on the universities of Scotland, especially in their professional departments. It is true that in their actual condition these universities form no exceptions to this rule, for nothing can be more flagrantly at variance with the real state of the case than to pretend that in each of them

---

\* With a view to giving value to the degree we would call attention to an expedient which existed in former times, and which, under some form, might very well be adopted in our own. In speaking of the Law School at Rome, Mr. Kirkpatrick mentions (p. 185.) that 'a record of the proficiency of each student was sent in to the Government, in order that the latter might thereby be guided in the selection of fit individuals for the public service.' And the author of the 'Notes on the Constitutions of Universities, &c.' p. 18., tells us that, in France, in the 14th century, 'it was a rule to nominate the graduates of the university to vacant benefices in the Church; and the university periodically made up and transmitted to the Pope a roll of its graduates in a certain order of preference with the view of nomination to the benefices.'

all the faculties are so represented as to entitle them to grant the corresponding professional degrees. Still such is the theory regarding them which\* prevails in Scotland, and, the less it squares with the fact, the more glaring of course are the practical absurdities to which it leads. St. Andrew's is a small provincial town inhabited chiefly by the upper classes, it has no hospital, and only one medical professor, and consequently *can* have no medical school; still St. Andrew's grants medical degrees just as Edinburgh does. Now Edinburgh is distant from St. Andrew's not more than a couple of hours by railway; its medical school, which has always enjoyed an excellent reputation, has ten or eleven professors, and being situated in a large town it has hospitals of every description at its command. Can there, in such circumstances, be a doubt that the pretended medical school of St. Andrew's ought to be transferred to Edinburgh? \*

Again: as courts of law hold to the practical side of the Faculty of Law pretty much the same place that hospitals do to that of Medicine, and as the supreme courts sit only in Edinburgh, it seems pretty clear that there alone can a complete Faculty of Law exist. Yet Faculties of Law nominally exist not only in Glasgow but in both the universities of Aberdeen. It is possible that the single chairs by which these so-called faculties are represented may be of some service in training sheriff court procurators, and with that view it may be desirable that practically they should remain on their present footing. But to talk of them as Faculties in their present condition is to pervert the use of language; and to attempt to develope them into Faculties in obedience to a preconceived notion of a university which we have shown to have no foundation in history, would be to strive after the impossible in a field in which the noblest possibilities surround us on every side.

The only faculty which all the universities must possess in the most efficient condition possible is Arts. *Universitas fundatur in artibus*: without arts they are not universities at all. Even in arts, however, it is scarcely necessary that the *professional* department should be equally complete in all. If it existed in a developed state in two,—say Edinburgh and St. Andrew's,—it would probably suffice that in the others it

---

\* Though medicine nominally made part of the *studium generale* which was at first established in all the colleges, its actual teaching is of quite modern date. In their Report on St. Andrew's the Commissioners state that there was no Professorship of Medicine till 1721, and that it did not become effective till 1811.

should be left in the hands of the present professors, relieved as they would be by the tutors from the most burdensome of their labours connected with the curriculum. .

In Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, it is no doubt indispensable that there should be faculties of Theology and Medicine; but surely it is not indispensable that in Aberdeen there should be imperfect duplicates of each of these faculties. In a country so scantily supplied with learned appointments as Scotland we should be loath indeed to propose a diminution of their number. Even a corresponding increase in the value of those that remained would by no means console us for such a sacrifice; for whilst they continue to exist as separate offices, there is always a chance of their being fed from without, but when they begin to be fattened by swallowing up each other, there is an end to all prospect of a substantial gain to learning. But that surely is no reason why two sets of endowed professors should be engaged in teaching the same subjects, whilst many subjects of the greatest importance in both the faculties to which they belong, and particularly in the Theological Faculty, are unrepresented altogether. It is surely an anomaly that whilst pious Aberdeen has two professors of Midwifery, it should not have one professor of Biblical Criticism!\*

From these observations it follows that the 'Bill to provide for the Union of the Universities of King's College and Marischal College, Aberdeen,' which has been prepared and brought into Parliament by Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Thompson, as regards its general principle at least, has our cordial approval.

Another step which we would gladly see taken with a view to giving unity of purpose to the Scottish Universities, is the formal recognition of St. Andrew's as the Theological School of Scotland, not exclusively of course, but pre-eminently. St. Andrew's has been called the Canterbury of Scotland; and its antecedents are in truth altogether ecclesiastical. In Roman Catholic times it was the seat of the archiepiscopal see, and the headquarters of such theological learning as the country possessed. Its university and its colleges were endowed by Bishops and confirmed by Popes; and in the list of its

---

\* On this head it is rather curious to remark that in Scotland altogether the professors who are occupied with the care of the body are *twice* as numerous as those to whom the interests of the soul are confided, and about *six times* as numerous as those who deal with the moral and social relations of the citizen of this world! A like overweening solicitude about the animal portion of our nature is not exhibited in the arrangements of any other civilised people.

dignitaries are to be found the names of almost every one who held a prominent place in the profession which then comprised the whole spiritual activity and life of the times. From the very first, too, it has a hold on Protestant sympathies,—for it was at St. Andrew's, during the episcopate of Bishop Wardlaw, the founder of the University, that the persecution of the Lollards in Scotland took place; and probably on the very spot on which Hamilton and Wishart suffered, Paul Craw, the Bohemian physician, a century before had preceded them in martyrdom. It was in St. Salvator's College, where their great enemy Cardinal Beaton had studied a few years before them, that Major\* taught to Knox and Buchanan the religious and political doctrines which made the one the leader of the Reformation in Scotland, and enabled the other to anticipate the opinions of Milton and Algernon Sydney, and to propound, a hundred years earlier, the principles of Government which finally gained the ascendant in 1688. To St. Andrew's, too, belong the names of John Craig, Knox's colleague in Edinburgh, Andrew Melville, the founder of Scotch presbyterianism, Alexander Henderson, George Gillespie, Samuel Rutherford, and, on the other side, those of Archbishop Sharp, Archbishop Spotswood, and a host of others scarcely less venerated. We believe these recollections to be of the greatest practical importance for the objects which we have in view. If a generous extraction be a precious gift (and he is a fool to whom it is not) we have here the means of bestowing it on the Scottish student of Theology by giving him, if not a personal, at least a professional pedigree. Nor has St. Andrew's degenerated from its former position so far as not to exhibit in some degree even now the character which we wish to see restored to it. Its Theological School, as the most ancient, is regarded as the first in rank; its Principal is the highest permanent dignitary of the Church of Scotland; and its staff of four professors, inadequate though it be, is equal to that in the Metropolitan University of Edinburgh. St. Mary's College, too, ever since the Reformation, has stood out, in a certain sense, from the other divinity schools as the only separate establishment in Scotland devoted exclusively to the study of Theology. Lastly, in point of locality, the entire suitableness of St. Andrew's for theological study seems as unquestionable as its unsuitableness for a medical school.

---

\* 'Solo cognomine Major,' was a mere harmless pleasantry in which Buchanan indulged at the expense of the name, not the character, of his old preceptor.

Again, when we turn to Edinburgh, we find that the proper function of its university in our own day is marked out by its antecedents, scarcely less clearly than that of St. Andrew's. From the very first it was a lay establishment. Its founder was a king, its patrons were, and are, a municipal corporation, and its first principal, Robert Rollock, though, like Buchanan, he lectured on theology, and was moderator of the General Assembly, like him also, was more of a scholar than a theologian, and more of a layman than an ecclesiastic. The character which was thus given to it at the beginning has adhered ever since to the University of Edinburgh; and though it has all along possessed a highly respectable Theological Faculty, its prominent Faculties unquestionably have been those of Medicine and Arts. Of the defects of the latter, and the means of remedying them, we have already spoken at length. Though its metropolitan position and other advantages have invariably attracted to the Faculty of Arts in Edinburgh professors of the highest eminence, it differs in its constitution in no respect from the corresponding faculties in the other universities; and if the observations which we have made with reference to the Faculties of Arts in general be well founded, they have a special application to that of the University of Edinburgh. As the typical university for the whole country, Edinburgh ought in all the faculties (with the possible exception of Theology) to be brought as near to perfection as circumstances will permit; and with this view its Faculty of Arts ought to be made complete both in its preliminary curriculum and its ultimate professional department. As regards the Faculty of Medicine, it is a matter for congratulation, and ought to be a source of encouragement, that this object has already been in a great measure attained. Even in this branch of science, we do not doubt that defects may be pointed out by the eminent professors who belong to it, well worthy of the consideration of those to whom the great work of university legislation may ultimately be confided. To the non-professional observer its chief defect seems to consist in the absence of any guarantee for preliminary instruction; and this defect, we believe, it has, in common with every other school of Medicine in the kingdom.

But there is another faculty of which only the rudiments exist in Edinburgh as yet, though, as belonging of right to the metropolitan university specially, and perhaps exclusively, we must here direct to it the attention of our readers. In speaking of the Faculty of Law, we are happily relieved from the necessity of expressing a personal opinion. The proper function of such a faculty, professionally, socially, and po-



litically — its present condition in Edinburgh — and the means best adapted for bringing the latter into harmony with the former, have all been made the subjects of earnest and recent consideration by the Faculty of Advocates, and by the courtesy of that learned body we have been furnished with the very careful and interesting reports in which their committees have embodied the results of their deliberations.

The history of the profession of the Law in Scotland brings us at once in contact with a specialty in the origin and growth of the higher intellectual life of the inhabitants of that country, which ought never to be lost sight of in comparing their institutions with those of England: we refer, of course, to the very intimate relations which for centuries subsisted between Scotland and the continent of Europe. In their first Report, 'On the 'Qualifications of Intrants,' the Committee remind the Faculty that—

'It is a matter of historical fact that Scotch lawyers, from the institution of the College of Justice down to a comparatively recent period, were in the habit of acquiring a knowledge of the Civil Law, and of completing their general education, at continental universities. Their education there frequently occupied a number of years; and, not contented with attending the lectures of the professors, they also sometimes attached themselves to some celebrated lawyer, at whose consultations they were present. It had come to be so much the prevailing practice, that in the reign of Charles I., it was thought "strange to see ane man\* admitted to teach the lawes who was "never out of the countrie studieing and learning the lawes." The reputation of several eminent French professors attracted to the French universities students from all quarters of Europe. After a time, however, the current changed, and Scotchmen went to Leyden and Utrecht instead of Bourges and Toulouse.

'On their return home from this foreign education they applied for admission to the Bar upon a petition which gave an account of their university studies.'† Numerous illustrations of the above statements are then inserted from the records of the faculty.

'The practice of attending continental universities continued more or less down to near the end of last century. It terminated with the wars consequent on the French Revolution. As the French armies entered Leyden and Utrecht, the last resident Scotch teachers left; and the connexion between Scotland and the Low Countries in matters of education was then finally closed. How intimate this must have been is evident from the single circumstance, that in almost all the universities of France, Holland, and Italy, Scotchmen

---

\* James Sandilands, Professor of Civil and Canon Laws in King's College, Aberdeen. (Spalding's History of the Troubles, vol. vi. p. 179.)

† P. 5.

were professors; and Hadrian Damman of Bysterveldt, a Dutchman, was appointed in the year 1594 Professor of Law in the University of Edinburgh.

‘The influence of this continental study was felt as well in moulding the character and bearing of the men as in modifying the Law itself.’

But whilst in both these respects it was advantageous, it was this very custom which in another direction led to the defect which it is now the object of the Faculty of Advocates to remedy—the want, namely, of anything like a complete national School of Law. So long as the custom continued to prevail the defect was little felt; so little indeed that up to the commencement of last century, though occasionally a single professor is met with, no attempt was made to establish a Faculty of Law in the University of Edinburgh. It is not unlikely that the Faculty of Advocates, approving as they did of foreign study, regarded the absence of a native school as a positive benefit to their profession. But when the custom ceased, and foreign study in place of the rule became the rare exception, a very different feeling arose. The three original chairs in the University of Edinburgh were all established within twenty years; and during the century which has since elapsed questions as to the proper measure of home instruction, professional and general, and the best means of communicating and enforcing it, have at intervals occupied the attention of the Faculty of Advocates. Down to the date of the resolution which we are about to mention, however, no adequate substitute for the previous foreign education was imposed. The avenues to the highest branch of the legal profession were never, it is true, left so wholly unguarded in Scotland as in England they still continue to be. No course of general training was prescribed, but there was a civil law examination which involved the public reading of the Pandects, and at the interval of a year there was another examination in the municipal law of Scotland. But these examinations, conducted as they were by members of the Bar, without the concurrence of the professors of law in the University, naturally assumed a tone which was easy and indulgent rather than accurate and trustworthy. Even as legal examinations their character depended on the temper of the examiners who chanced to be in office, and as a means of ascertaining the general acquirements of the candidates they were at all times unsatisfactory. Both of these objections seem to have been met by the conclusions at which the Committee of Advocates arrived, which the Faculty afterwards unanimously

adopted, and in favour of which they have since memorialised Her Majesty's Government, to the following effect:—

‘I. That the course of University instruction in Law urgently requires to be improved and extended; and that, besides its present subjects, it ought to comprise a course of lectures on Private International Law, or the Conflict of Laws, a course of Lectures on Public International Law, and a course of Lectures on Constitutional Law.

‘II. That the principles of General Jurisprudence form an important subject for University instruction, whether imparted by each respective Professor of Law, illustrating so much of these principles as more particularly relates to the department of his own Chair, or imparted in a course of separate lectures appropriated to General Jurisprudence itself.

‘III. That the Criminal Law of Scotland, in place of forming a subordinate portion of the same course of lectures which embraces generally the Scots Municipal Law, should be made, by itself, the subject of a short but complete course of lectures, delivered from the Scots Law Chair.

‘IV. That in order to carry out these views, and to attain the great national object of a more complete School of Law, it would be necessary that an addition should be made to the number of Professors of Law in the University of Edinburgh; and that, for this end, it is highly desirable that the Public Law Chair in the University of Edinburgh should be restored to a state of efficiency, and also that a new Law Chair should be established in that University.

‘V. That it is indispensable to the efficiency of the respective Chairs, that each of them should possess an endowment sufficient to render the Chair an object of ambition to men of acknowledged talents and reputation.

‘VI. That in any measures which it may be deemed advisable to adopt for the purpose of obtaining the requisite endowments, the Faculty should have fully in their view the existing claims of the Public Law Chair, under the Royal Letters Patent, dated 11th February, 1707.’

The nature of these claims is set forth in the memorial in such a manner as to be perfectly intelligible even to the non-professional reader; and there seems every reason to believe that, had not the Chair accidentally become vacant during the political excitement which preceded the passing of the Reform Bill (1831), it would have been in active operation at the present time. But the Faculty tell us that, if a professor were appointed even now, ‘he might probably be found entitled, by virtue of his office alone, to bring an action for payment of the salary of 150*l.* out of the bishop's fruits and rents, in respect of his being the express grantee of the Crown to a salary of that amount, payable out of that fund.’ If this be

so, the Lord Advocate ought at once to give an earnest of his good intentions in the matter of Scottish University Reform, by recommending the appointment of such a professor. It can be nothing but ignorance of the true position of the case which can induce the Government of Queen Victoria apparently to fall short of the measure of liberality which characterised that of Queen Anne.

Both the Committee of the House of Commons and that of the legal profession in Scotland have stated it emphatically as their opinion, that the scope of legal instruction ought not to be measured by the bare requirements of the practitioner.

‘A system of legal education,’ say the Commons, ‘to be of general advantage, must comprehend and meet the wants not only of the professional but also of the unprofessional student.’ ‘While the education of professional men,’ say the Advocates, ‘forms the *primary* object of University instruction in law, it should not be forgotten that there is at all times a large number of the youth of this country in attendance at the University, to whom legal instruction, in one or other of its branches, must be an object of great importance, though they do not contemplate a professional life. And for them also there should be such instruction duly provided, if the State justly apprehends and performs its educational duties towards the community. There are those students, for example, who desire to prepare themselves for the efficient discharge of the official or magisterial duties, which in this kingdom are so generally devolved, at one time or other, on men who hold any prominent social position. There are those students who look forward to either House of Parliament as their future arena, or who contemplate diplomatic life in any of its departments, or who mean to seek employment in India or the Colonies; —or, in fine, who desire to receive a finished practical education as accomplished gentlemen. These various classes of students form at all times an important portion of the youth of Scotland in attendance at the University; and the Committee have arrived very decidedly at the conclusion, that the course of legal instruction provided by the State is defective and incomplete if it fails to meet the wants of each and all of these.’ (P. 2.)

A coincidence of opinion so unequivocal on the part of two bodies acting altogether independently of each other, and each speaking with the authority of the whole legal profession in the country which it represents, surely demands for that opinion the respectful consideration of those to whom the welfare of the general, more than even of the professional, community is intrusted. The very branches of study recommended are identical,—in both cases it is International and Constitutional Law. In giving precedence to the former of these branches, however, or even in placing it on a level with the latter, it seems to us

that these learned bodies have been actuated in some degree by the prepossessions which, *not* unfortunately, cling to professional men. In a country which, though conterminous with none, has, perhaps for that very reason, relations with almost every nation on earth, the utility of a knowledge of Private International Law to the legal practitioner, and of Public International Law to the legislator, and, above all, the diplomatist, can be doubted by no reasonable man. Nor is it difficult to see that, though not more urgent, the study of this branch of jurisprudence will be vastly more easy in Scotland than in England. The Roman Civil Law, which is only now beginning to be cultivated in England, has for centuries formed part of ordinary legal instruction in Scotland; its principles lie at the root of the national system, and its terminology, which an eminent English professor\* has recently said is 'fast becoming the *lingua franca* of 'universal jurisprudence,' becomes, insensibly and involuntarily, the groundwork of the technical speech of every Scotch lawyer. But though there may be excellent reasons for the cultivation of International Law in England, and special inducements to its cultivation in Scotland, it by no means follows that, to the general student at all events, it has a greater or an equal importance with Constitutional Law. Viewed as British subjects simply, the relation in which we stand to these two branches of law respectively, seems to be, that whilst with International Law we may have to do any day, with Constitutional Law we must have to do every day; the relations of State to State may concern any one; the relations of the citizen to his own State must concern every one. And there is this farther difference between them in the same direction,—that in our international dealings—if they are private—we may be guided by a lawyer; if they are public,—we must be governed by those to whom we have officially confided them; whereas in our relations with our own State we all of us act, and must act, on our own responsibility and according to our own individual lights.

Nor is the fact of the greater popular interest attaching to Constitutional Law unimportant for the practical guidance of the reformers of legal education in Scotland. If the somewhat hazardous experiment is to be tried of leaving either of these Chairs dependent for success to any extent on the fees of students, it clearly indicates that the risk of failure will be less with Constitutional than International Law. Nor are we left to gather

---

\*Roman Law and Legal Education, by Henry Sumner Maine, LL.D. Cambridge Essays, 1856, p. 14.

this conclusion merely from the nature of the subjects in question. The test of experience has not been wholly wanting even in Scotland. International Law was the subject which was formerly taught from the Chair of Public Law in Edinburgh, and it was on the ground of its alleged unpopularity and the consequent difficulty of forming a class, that that Chair was suffered to fall into abeyance. Constitutional Law, on the contrary, was taught in Glasgow at the very same time with great success, and attracted students in abundance, many of them of very high social rank, even from England. Such an experience seems in itself to indicate the propriety of trying any new experiment in the first instance not with International but with Constitutional Law. Nor need the name of the Edinburgh Chair, or the traditions attaching to that name, interfere with the change of subject which we here recommend, seeing that the term Public Law, up to the time of Grotius, was applied exclusively to what in England we call Constitutional Law, and even now is, and can be, applied only to one, and that by no means the most extensive or difficult branch of the department of jurisprudence of which Grotius is commonly regarded as the founder.

On the wide, and we fear we must add, the vexed question, of the Constitution of the Scottish Universities, we purposely abstain from offering any decided opinion. We do so because we regard it as far less important and far more dependent on special and local considerations than has been sometimes imagined. In speaking of the older universities of Continental Europe, the author of the 'Notes' has remarked that 'if the constitutions of two universities agreed in six points they disagreed in as many more;' and the dictum is entirely in accordance with the results of such historical reading as we ourselves possess on the subject. Argue and scheme as we may, the question always will be, as it always has been, settled, not on general principles, but on special, local, and individual feelings, interests, and prejudices, and where these do not run counter to universal human laws we shall probably produce, in each particular instance, a far more efficient machine by deferring to them than by setting them at defiance. A very searching inquiry into the claims of the graduates to participate in the government and patronage of the Scottish Universities, has resulted in depriving their pretensions of all historical standing-ground. But it by no means follows that the formation of a real academical self-governing body, acting through means of some such University Senate as the Commissioners recom-

mended, may not be a measure urgently called for on grounds of expediency applicable to our own day; and the present system in Scotland, which vests many of the most important functions of academical government in the town-councils of cities and boroughs, appears to us to be an evil and an obstacle lying at the root of all effectual reform. The members of the University ought to administer its property, its patronage, and its honours. Nor is there any reason to suppose that, independently of the government of the universities, benefits of a very substantial kind, in the form of gifts and legacies, might not result from giving to the graduates of Scotch, as of English universities, an interest in these institutions which should endure through life. In so far as this can be effected by the suffrage, we look forward with confidence for its attainment to the next measure of Electoral Reform.

Finally, in presenting this subject to the consideration of our readers, we are very far from supposing that we address ourselves exclusively to those of them who are resident in, or directly connected with, Scotland. The institutions which have the training of our youth for their object, more immediately than any other, affect the whole empire; and if there is one branch of these institutions which has this character more than another, it is that which professes to deal with the highest instruction of the class devoted to the service of the country and the commonwealth. But it is not only because we know that what Scotchmen learn in Edinburgh they are very likely to practise in London, that Englishmen are interested in the Scottish universities. These universities, from their less ecclesiastical character, from their greater cheapness, from the prominence which is given to the professorial element in their teaching, and from other causes, have always been complementary to the universities of England. They have afforded in times past—and, if freed from the imperfections which at present weigh them down, will continue to afford—most valuable opportunities of academical education to a numerous class of Englishmen who would either be debarred from the higher studies altogether, or driven to seek them abroad,—the latter alternative being one of which Englishmen avail themselves far less readily and willingly than Scotchmen. That this benefit need not be confined to dissenters, and to the less wealthy classes in England, will be apparent, when we remind our readers that the Scottish universities can lay claim to some of the most eminent of our living statesmen, and that Lord Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston, and Lord John Russell may be mentioned among

those who on all occasions willingly acknowledge the advantages they derived from their early residence in a school where Dugald Stuart expounded the nature of man, and Adam Smith treated of the interests of the citizen.

ART. IV.—*The Angel in the House*. By COVENTRY PATMORE.  
Second edition. 2 vols. London: 1857.

DURING the first quarter of the present century the most popular of our poets sought their themes in distant regions and at remote periods. In this pursuit of novelty they broke through some of the earliest and most pleasing characteristics of English poetry. Chaucer, though in his youthful works he had affected classical and mythological subjects, in his last and greatest, the ‘*Canterbury Tales*,’ was for nothing more remarkable than for the homely vigour with which he treated English character and manners. In this respect he was the precursor of Shakspeare; and in many of his stories we find an anticipation of that genial humour, which inspired the ‘*Merry Wives of Windsor*,’ and ‘*Henry the Fourth*.’ The great Elizabethan school borrowed much from the romantic sources of Italy and Spain; but its peculiar English vein was rather thus enriched than absorbed and lost. The classic and the stately Muse of our great poets of the seventeenth century was followed by the playful grace of Herrick, and the touching elegance of Habington. The ‘*Queen Anne wits*’ introduced among us the French school of poetry, with its fine execution, its didactic vein, and its spurious antique, dressed up in the wigs and ruffles of Louis the Fourteenth’s court. But as soon as this fashion began to wear out, our national poetry showed again its home-bred characteristics. Some of its reviving efforts were ponderous enough, from Somerville’s ‘*Chace*,’ and Falconer’s ‘*Shipwreck*,’ down to the poem on the art of making cyder; but Thomson sang of nature in no unworthy strains, and Cowper caught the ease, the humour, and the tenderness of domestic life, in happy harmony with the mind of England; while Beattie, and not a few other Scotch poets, advanced along that road which Allan Ramsay had first trod, till the series closed with the great original genius of Burns.

But the practice of painting in foreign colours, to which we have referred, was not by any means a universal characteristic of our poets in the earlier part of the present century. Rogers, like Goldsmith, his model, found his most pleasing inspiration at home, by our own firesides, or upon the village green and in the



rural dance; and the chief productions of Wordsworth were a formal protest against the taste most prevalent, and the works most popular, in his day. The cause, however, for which he pleaded was rather humble life than English life, and he might have found his themes among the peasantry in any part of Europe, rather than among the highly coloured and distorted heroes of some of his contemporaries. In his poetry the shepherd of Helvellyn takes his place with the shepherd of 'Grongar Hill,' and the rustic of Burns; but in conventional life, whether at home or abroad, Wordsworth saw nothing simple enough or real enough to be worthy of song. It was otherwise with Crabbe, who was contented with the workhouse, if he found there groups worthy of his dry but accurate pencil, and who, had his sense of the beautiful been but equal to his perception of the actual, and had he known how to marry the vowels with the consonants of art, might have reached some of the highest aims of poetry. The most popular writers of the time were, however, in the opposite extreme, and too often forgot that the office of the poet is not merely to set forth the beautiful, but rather to interpret truth in the forms of beauty, and to exalt the real by making it the minister of the ideal.

Without any disposition to underrate the heroic achievements of Turkish pirates and border chiefs, or to forget the many-vestured muse of Southey, the Italian grace and gaiety of Leigh Hunt and Landor, or the sublimer inspiration of Shelley and Keats, it cannot be denied that the poetry which charmed us twenty-five years ago has now lost something of its fascination even to the young, and that the fashion or the taste of the present time seems rather to favour a more calm and subdued expression of the poetic feeling. The delineation of home scenery, the reproduction of familiar emotions, the drama of domestic life, requires a more delicate sense of art, more finished execution, and more careful treatment than the poems which appeal violently to the imagination or the passions. The works to which we refer are in fact to poetry what the pictures of the Dutch masters, or of Greuze and Watteau, are to painting. They leave the sublime conceptions of the art to be dealt with by bolder hands; but they win the attention and charm the feeling by a grace and fidelity which sheds its beauty over the simplest incidents of life. Lesbia weeping for her sparrow is more fondly remembered than the finest passage of the Pharsalia; and a discriminating criticism places the rural labours of the Georgics above the most elaborate scenes in the *Æneid*.

Within the last few years several poems have been written on the principle of versifying the manners of the day, but with very different degrees of success; Mr. Tennyson himself set the

example, and after him we descend from the impassioned, but coarse and unrhythmical, pages of Aurora Leigh to the 'City Poems' of Mr. Alexander Smith. But the instances of failure among these recent aspirants have been more numerous than those in which they have hit the mark. Some of them have split upon the rock of politics, or rather of party spleen; for the genuine political relations are so closely connected with the deeper interests of man, human and moral, and respond so quickly beneath the fiery breath of imaginative passion, that they may possibly be included within the domain of genuine poetry. Others, instead of representing, have caricatured modern life. They seem to have forgotten that the railway whistle, and the smoke of the factory chimney, are but accidents of our age, as powder and patch were accidents of a preceding one, and that the true life of the nineteenth century must lie deeper. Still worse does the failure become when, in the desire to be familiar, the poet has substituted the slang of the day for the less offensive conventionality of a stilted diction.

Of these poems which attempt to describe the finer emotions of modern society, the most original and the most artistic which we have seen is Mr. Coventry Patmore's '*Angel in the House*;' a poem, the existence of which is better than a thousand *à priori* arguments in favour of the school to which it belongs. Its merit is more than sufficient to account for its success, both among ourselves and in America, where, if we are rightly informed, twenty thousand copies of it are already in circulation. Mr. Patmore's hero does not hide his nineteenth century extraction in tartan or plaid, or even in 'homely russet brown;' he is a young man of good birth and gentle breeding; has won university honours, and lectured at the neighbouring institute. The lady of his love is one of the three daughters of a Dean of Salisbury. The scene lies in the cathedral close or near to it, and the incidents of the poem never rise above the familiar occurrences of English domestic life. The task Mr. Patmore has undertaken to perform is to trace, with no other colouring and no more elaborate decorations than these, the ebb and flow of those feelings which are in every rank of life the well-head of poetry.

The '*Angel in the House*' is a tale in verse, the hero of which sings the wooing and winning of his bride. The interest of the poem is studiously rendered independent of vicissitudes; the merit of it consists entirely in its careful and ingenious execution. Such a mode of treatment, while it increases the difficulty of the performance, in proportion as it foregoes the excitements derived from romantic adventure, is doubtless necessitated by the author's desire to illustrate ordinary, not ex-

ceptional, modern life. This necessity has been turned, like difficulties of position or material in the hands of a real architect, to no small account. Renouncing the stimulus of curiosity, the poet has derived the interest of his work from higher sources, the philosophic analysis of the affections, and a descriptive power equally harmonious and vivid. The structure of the poem divides itself into two classes of compositions; the former entitled *Pre-ludes*, and consisting of meditations on life and character, the latter of a series of descriptive Pictures.

The narrative opens with a description of the return of its hero to an abode which, in earlier times, had been occasionally his home.

‘Once more I came to Sarum Close,  
 With joy half memory, half desire,  
 And breath’d the sunny air that rose  
 And blew the shadows o’er the spire,  
 And tossed the lilac’s scented blooms,  
 And sway’d the chesnut’s thousand cones,  
 And fill’d my nostrils with perfumes,  
 And shaped the clouds in waifs and zones,  
 And wafted down the serious strain  
 Of Sarum bells, when, true to time,  
 I reach’d the Dean’s, with heart and brain  
 That trembled to the trembling chime.’ (P. 16.)

He finds his old friend—

‘By widowhood more than winters bent,  
 But settled in a cheerful mind,’

and with him his three daughters, much changed from what they were in their childish days. The eldest has forgotten prudery, and developed into fearless grace; the second, formerly pale, sickly, and wholly absorbed in thoughts of the next world, has grown reconciled to this one; while the youngest has thrown aside her hoop to pursue graver attractions. The picture of the Deanery, with its

‘Dim rich lustre of old oak  
 And crimson velvets glowing gloom,

is extremely dignified and clerical.

‘Something that abode endued  
 With temple-like repose, an air  
 Of life’s kind purposes pursued  
 With ordered freedom, sweet and fair.  
 A tent pitched in a world not right  
 It seem’d, whose inmates, every one,  
 On tranquil faces bore the light  
 Of duties beautifully done,

And humbly, though they had few peers,  
Kept their own laws, which seemed to be  
The fair sum of six thousand years'  
Traditions of civility.' (P. 21.)

Not without some blundering movements, and a slight inclination at first to fix itself on the wrong sister, the young man's love attaches itself to Honoria, the eldest; a fact with which he first becomes acquainted when he finds her seated next a certain handsome cousin, who had come to take leave before embarking for a cruise in the Levant. After a morning call, in which he walks with his new friends about their garden, discusses the flower show and the ball, admires the prize-pinks and the prize-book, counts the apricots on a single tree, and feeds the gold fish, the lover rides home; and after settling accounts with his chief tenant, whom he finds at his door, whip in hand, and ready with soiled bank notes, throws himself on his knees—

'And vow'd to love, and prayed to wed,  
The maiden who had grown so dear.'

Her father's consent is narrated with an amusing particularity.

'A dear, good girl! she'd have  
Only three thousand pounds as yet;  
More bye and bye.'

This sum, with his own fortune of 600*l.* per annum, and a small park, wood, and expectations, seems to the lover amply sufficient, if we may judge from the following passage; one of the many with which the present edition (in all respects a great improvement on the preceding one, whether as to insertions, omissions, or alterations) has been enriched. It is entitled 'Life of Life' (p. 93.):—

'What's that which, ere I spake, was gone,  
So joyful and intense a spark  
That, whilst o'erhead the wonder shone,  
The day, before but dull, was dark?  
I do not know; but this I know,  
That, had the splendour lived a year,  
The truth that I some heavenly show  
Did see, could not be now more clear.  
This know I too: might mortal breath  
Express the passion then inspired,  
Evil would die a natural death,  
And nothing transient be desired;  
And error from the soul would pass,  
And leave the senses pure and strong  
As sunbeams. But the best, alas,  
Has neither memory nor tongue.'

The lover has still, however, to live on hope, not gratitude. The theft of a glove, and the present, skilfully excused, of three violets, 'two white, one blue,' said to come from the three sisters, but actually enclosed in a note written by one of them only, is too unsubstantial fare for him; and the contrast between his ardour and the happy serenity of the maiden who—'artless 'in her very art,' looks down on her votary with lunar smiles,—is well described in a canto entitled '*Ætna and the Moon.*' Half sanguine, half in despair, the lover resolves to decide his fate.

"Honorina," I began —No more.

The Dean, by ill or happy hap,  
Came home; and Wolf burst in before,  
And put his nose upon her lap.'

He defers the trial, and accompanies the young Syrens of the Deanery on an expedition to Stonehenge. This canto is in itself an exquisite idyl. We can find space but for the concluding lines.

'By the great stones we chose our ground  
For shade; and there, in converse sweet,  
Took luncheon. On a little mound  
Sat the three ladies; at their feet  
I sat; and smelt the heathy smell,  
Pluck'd harebells, turn'd the telescope  
To the country round. My life went well,  
For once, without the wheels of hope;  
And I despised the Druid rocks  
That scowl'd their chill gloom from above,  
Like churls whose stolid wisdom mocks  
The lightness of immortal love;  
And, as we talk'd, my spirit quaff'd  
The sparkling winds; the candid skies  
At our untruthful strangeness laugh'd;  
I kissed with mine her smiling eyes;  
And sweet familiarity and awe  
Prevailed that hour on either part,  
And in the eternal light I saw  
That she was mine; though yet my heart  
Could not conceive, nor would confess  
Such contentation; and there grew  
More form and more fair stateliness  
Than heretofore, between us two.' (P. 102.)

The lover does not escape such smaller calamities as beset our nineteenth century life. The Dean and his eldest daughter go to London for a month, and Salisbury Plain begins to lose its charm.

‘She near, all for the time was well;  
 Hope’s self, when we were far apart,  
 With lonely feeling, *like the smell*  
*Of heath on mountains, fill’d my heart.*’

Her lover stands a moment beside the railway carriage, gives her, to beguile the tedium of the journey, a priceless Tasso, which, merely for the pleasure of making a fruitless sacrifice, he hopes she may lose, and then, —

‘The bell rang, and, with shrieks like death,  
 Link catching link, the long array,  
 With ponderous pulse and fiery breath,  
 Proud of its burden, swept away.’

He mounts the hill-side and watches the lessening line of white vapour as it trails along the green landscape; indulges in evil forebodings, and doubts whether the most perfect of her sex may not be corrupted in London, forget him, and acquire

‘The foolish, fashionable air  
 Of knowing all, and feeling naught.’

He returns past her house, hears the clock chiming through the lonely hall; thinks how little Honoria is really appreciated even by her sisters or the Dean, and feels convinced that her bird will be starved, and that her flowers will die for want of water. He stays for evening prayers, and strays home through the wood, listening to the blackbird who ‘talked by himself’ amid the branches, of Honoria and desertion. She returns, however, and things go on again as before. The following passage, which proves that Love is capable of even teaching early rising, we must quote, as an illustration of Mr. Patmore’s delineations of nature: —

‘I woke at three; for I was bid  
 To breakfast with the Dean at nine,  
 And take his girls to church. I slid  
 My curtain, found the season fine,  
 And could not rest, so rose. The air  
 Was dark and sharp; the roosted birds  
 Cheep’d, “Here am I, sweet; are you there?”  
 On Avon’s misty flats the herds  
 Expected, comfortless, the day,  
 Which slowly fired the clouds above;  
 The cock screamed, somewhere far away;  
 In sleep the matrimonial dove  
 Was brooding; no wind waked the wood,  
 Nor moved the midnight river-damps,  
 Nor thrill’d the poplar; quiet stood  
 The chesnut with its thousand lamps;

The moon shone yet, but weak and drear,  
 And seemed to watch with bated breath,  
 The landscape, all made sharp and clear  
 By stillness, as a face by death.' (P. 123.)

The love-trouble, however, is not on one side only. The following passages convey an analysis of woman's love in its birth, growth, and progress, written with great subtlety of discernment and richness of poetry.

'She wearies with an ill unknown;  
 In sleep she sobs, and seems to float,  
 A water-lily, all alone  
 Within a lonely castle moat;  
 And as the full-moon, spectral, lies  
 Within the crescent's gleaming arms,  
 The present shows her heedless eyes  
 A future dim with vague alarms.  
 She sees, and yet she scarcely sees;  
 For, life-in-life not yet begun,  
 Too many are its mysteries  
 For thought to fix t'wards any one.' (P. 143.)

Sometimes resistance seems impossible:—

'Advancing stepless, quick and still,  
 As in the grass a serpent glides,  
 He fascinates her fluttering will,  
 Then terrifies with dreadful strides.  
 At first, there's nothing to resist;  
 He fights with all the forms of peace;  
 He comes about her like a mist  
 With subtle, swift, unseen increase.'

At other times insensibility seems inhuman:—

'How sweetly he implies her praise!  
 His tender talk, his gentle tone,  
 The manly worship in his gaze,  
 It nearly makes her heart his own.  
 With what an air he speaks her name;  
 His manner always recollects  
 Her sex, and still the woman's claim  
 Is taught its scope by his respects.'

These passages will have prepared the reader for his proposal and its results:—

'Twice rose, twice died my trembling word;  
 The faint and frail Cathedral chimes  
 Spoke time in music, and we heard  
 The chafers rustling in the limes.

Her dress that touch'd me where I stood;  
 The warmth of her confided arm;  
 Her bosom's gentle neighbourhood;  
 Her pleasure in her power to charm;  
 Her look, her love, her form, her touch,  
 The least seem'd most by blissful turn,—  
 Blissful but that it pleased too much,  
 And taught the wayward soul to yearn.  
 It was as if a harp with wires  
 Was traversed by the breath I drew;  
 And, oh, sweet meeting of desires,  
 She, answering, owned she loved me too.'

The sternest of our readers must not grudge our lover his moment of triumph; but Honoria fears that she has yielded too soon:—

'My queen was crouching at my side,  
 By love unsceptred and brought low,  
 Her awful garb of maiden pride  
 All melted into tears like snow;  
 The mistress of my reverent thought,  
 Whose praise was all I asked of fame,  
 In my close-watched approval sought  
 Protection as from change and blame.  
 Her soul, which I had loved to invest  
 With pity for my poor desert,  
 Buried its face within my breast.  
 Like a pet fawn by hunters hurt.'

'He can take pains,' is said to have been one of the highest forms of approval with which Mr. Rogers gratified a young poet; and it is obvious that the musical flow of these lines, and the delicacy of the sentiment they convey, owe much of their charm to the genuine art bestowed on the composition. Yet the singular felicity of Mr. Patmore's diction is derived apparently rather from that habitual carefulness which gradually weds itself with spontaneity of style, than from elaborate correction. In its precision it never loses flexibility, nor does it sacrifice clearness in order to gain depth and grace. While eminently picturesque, it has also a remarkable power of expressing long trains of consecutive thought, not only without pedantry, but in language familiar and colloquial. In a few instances, indeed, it strikes us as a shade too colloquial. Such words as 'bouquet' and 'boudoir,' we cannot accept as sound English; we entirely demur to such a barbarism as 'contentation'; and we have observed a few other instances in which Mr. Patmore has fallen short of his usual custom, which is that of writing in the true '*lingua communis*,' at once classical and idiomatic.



We are disposed, moreover, to quarrel with the affected names which he has prefixed to several of his cantos. It would certainly be easy to substitute for 'Beulah,' 'Sahara,' and 'the 'Koh-i-nohr,' titles more akin to familiar associations.

Reverting to our introductory observations, our reader will not fail to detect the secret of Mr. Patmore's success in the poetical treatment of modern life. The picture with which he has presented us is not a caricature of the accidents belonging to modern society. Such accidents find their due place, but no more, in his verse; and they are treated with that skill which indicates, by a touch, the latent poetry of which nothing, except moral evil, is wholly deprived. But if the conventionalities of the day admit of being thus introduced, and laid aside, it is because our interest is riveted, throughout the bulk of the poem, by those moral relations and affections which belong to no age and no place in particular, and into the true character of which Mr. Patmore evinces so profound an insight. He appreciates the dignity of the social ties, and thus treading upon firm, unyielding ground, he can afford to sport with the lighter side of his theme. His philosophy of human life claims, as he tells us, no novelty; if it did, it could be little more than the last piece of charlatanism brought up by that great wheel which is ever replacing detected with forgotten quackeries. But truths in themselves not new, become new when they have been forgotten or petrified into truisms. The fancy sometimes acquires a daintiness which loses the fine in the superfine, and can only condescend to touch the honest realities of nature through the intervention of a white kid glove. Hence comes the sentimental school of versifiers, by whom Love is treated as if we lived in a moonlight world, and were too delicate to bear sunshine. The converse evil has yet more fatally debased literature at many periods. We allude to that grosser school which, under the guise of celebrating the passions, sings in reality the triumph of animal instincts thinly veiled. How many a passage in modern verse, if tried in a crucible sufficiently potent, would leave behind a residuum as earthy as the worst passages of Catullus and Ovid! Such writers have yet to learn that there subsists a humanity which is not clay; and that man was not endowed with reason and free will in order that the former might be the instrument of the appetites, and the latter their dupe and their slave. They need to know that passion, in proportion as it is truly human, is as fine pure as snow itself; that it is lighted from above, if fed in part from below; and that its mere material fuel is transformed as it is consumed. The gnomes of the world, poetic are more dangerous than the sylphs; but the

cause of their error is the same. They have missed the true philosophy of man.

From these blemishes Mr. Patmore's work is entirely free; his Honoria is the Castara of the nineteenth century; her unsullied purity is heightened by the strain of affectionate tenderness pervading the poem; but she attains the utmost refinement without effort and without affectation. In its manly and healthy cheer, the '*Angel in the House*' is an effectual protest against the morbid poetry of the age, as, in its serenity, it dissents from that '*spasmodic school*' which delights in jerks and jolts, and tolerates no music that has not a dash of discord in it.

Another attribute of Mr. Patmore's style seems to us yet more remarkable than his descriptive skill. His habit of justly balanced observation and reflection is constantly breaking forth in couplets of quaint and sententious subtlety, thus —

'How wise in all she ought to know,  
How ignorant of all beside!'

Or again —

'Love in tears too noble is  
For pity, save of Love in smiles.'

Sometimes it is mixed with pathos, as in the description of a disappointment —

'His fondness comes about his heart,  
As milk comes when the babe is dead.'

Or again —

'Through passionate duty love flames higher,  
As grass grows taller round a stone.'

At other times it is mixed with irony, as —

'How able her persuasions are  
To prove, her reasons to persuade.'

In the first edition of the poem this reflective vein presented itself in the more salient form of poetical aphorisms, under the name of '*The Sentences*,' appended to the descriptive passages. These more didactic pieces of philosophy seemed to us the least philosophical part of the book. Poetry refuses to take up more of philosophy than it can hold in solution; all mixtures less perfect cloud and discolour her clear element; and least of all can we be satisfied with the rough incrustation on the chalice or the sediment that lies at the bottom. The present edition is much improved by the rejection of these passages, and would, we think, be further improved by the rejection of some of them which have been allowed to remain in an altered form. As

an instance, we might refer to page 227., in which four lines, entitled 'A Word to the Wise,' express a sentiment already embodied with far more of simplicity and power in other parts of the poem. An analogous fault might perhaps be found with the degree to which the spirit of analysis is occasionally carried. Thus in Canto 1. Book 2., the lovers manage to be at cross purposes just when the reader expects them to be happy, and is prepared to be happy with them.

In the following lines a happier method is adopted; and the warfare against both a fantastic and a materialist philosophy is not the less successful for assuming a playful, not a dogmatic form. The fable is as clearly cut as a cameo, and might find its place in the Greek Anthology.

#### THE KITES.

'I saw three Cupids (so I dreamed),  
 Who made three kites, on which were drawn,  
 In letters that like roses gleamed,  
 "Plato," "Anacreon," and "Vaughan."  
 The boy who held by Plato tried  
 His airy venture first; all sail,  
 It heavenward rushed, till scarce descried,  
 Then pitch'd, and dropp'd for want of tail.  
 Anacreon's Love, with shouts of mirth  
 That pride of spirit thus should fall,  
 To his kite link'd a lump of earth,  
 And, lo, it would not soar at all.  
 Last, my disciple freighted his  
 With a long streamer made of flowers,  
 The children of the sod, and this  
 Rose in the sun and flew for hours.'

The Second Part of the 'Angel in the House,' entitled 'The Espousals,' is not less successful than the first in its illustration of everyday things. The Prologue with which it opens is particularly happily touched, more so, we should say, than the Epilogue at the conclusion of Part I. The tale has few incidents; but it is so well told that the reader forgets to look for them. He is contented with watching the skill with which the lover, happy enough to be unboundedly forbearing, pacifies 'Aunt Maude,' who has made up her mind to dislike the match; accompanies him to the 'County Ball' and the 'Regatta;' reads his 'love-letters;' and sympathises with various smaller troubles, some of which are described with much humour. To the latter class belongs the adventure narrated in the canto called 'The Friends.' The lover reproaches himself bitterly with having been false to an old friend, formerly his second self, whose un-

answered letter he accidentally lights upon as it lies in perilous rivalry with 'a gay blue sash.' The friend soon after arrives; and it turns out that he too has fallen in love, and been no less false to friendship than the penitent himself. Forgiveness is easy under such circumstances, and is interchanged with a laugh. We have next the 'Wedding,' the adieus, and an accidental meeting of the bride and bridegroom with the sailor-cousin, discarded in Part I. but who has since been promoted, and who entertains his lost love and his rival on board his ship with so frank and manly a bearing, as to excite the gratitude of the former, and the half-envy of the latter. Out of incidents familiar as these the poem is made. This circumstance suggests to us a remark. Novels have been frequently regarded as serious rivals in our day to poetry, stepping as they do into the field of imaginative literature, but demanding from the reader a less sustained exercise of the attention. In the work before us, as in 'Aurora Leigh,' poetry has in turn crossed the border and made reprisals. Nothing can be more slight than the texture of these compositions; but they have a sort of novelty derived from the poetic form they give to well-known objects; and Mr. Patmore's style of versification is remarkable for the qualities of smoothness and refinement in which Mrs. Browning is so lamentably deficient. We trust, however, that he will not allow his poetic talent to degenerate into mannerism; and that if he cherishes the domestic interests and familiar incidents of life, he will not carry these predilections to excess. A chain cannot be kept from trailing, if it be drawn out to too great a length. Mr. Patmore thus describes the object of his poetic ambition:—

'I, servant to the Truth in times  
When gaudy words are more than wit,  
And diligent in all my rhymes  
The truth with truest phrase to fit,  
Am unsolicitous to earn  
Mock laurels.'

Let him not fear then to be classed with 'modern mountebanks of speech;' for, to conclude with one of his own couplets, we too are

'Sure that the worthless oyster-heap  
Shall waste, and show the pearls at last.'

ART. V.—*Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox.* Edited by Lord JOHN RUSSELL. Vol. IV. London: 1857.

THE publication of the last volume of the *Memorials and Correspondence of Mr. Fox*, from the authentic materials edited by Lord John Russell, affords us an opportunity of reviewing our domestic history, in continuation of former articles which we have devoted to this and other recent works on the events of the period between the American War and the Peace of 1815.

In a previous article\*, we stated fully the evidence collected from different sources, which proves conclusively that the resignation of Mr. Pitt and his colleagues in the beginning of 1801, was caused by the refusal of the King to consent to the measures proposed by the Minister for the relief of the Irish Catholics consequent upon the Union; which event had taken effect on the 1st of January in that year. The policy which dictated this step was so much in advance of the general intelligence of the country, that the true explanation of the grounds of resignation has been generally received with incredulity by the popular historians of the period. During a visit which Sir J. Mackintosh paid to Mr. Dundas in the summer of the same year, the latter remarked that his experience in public affairs had taught him to place little faith in historians. ‘For instance,’ he said, ‘the motives which I and my colleagues have assigned for our resignation, drawn from the Popery question, no historian will believe; and, if any mentions it, he will treat it as a mere pretext to cover the real motive; and he will support his representation by very plausible arguments; yet nothing can be more true than that the reason we assigned was the real one.’† This anticipation has doubtless been, to a great extent, verified by the event: the documentary evidence published has, however, now manifested the truth, and shown that the distrust which Dundas, like Sir Robert Walpole, entertained for the accounts of historians, is, so far as it rests on this case, unfounded.

It is, in our opinion, difficult to exaggerate the loss which the nation sustained in the frustration of Mr. Pitt’s intended measure of Irish policy, by the irrational resistance of the King. At that

---

\* Ed. Review, vol. ciii. p. 305.

† Life of Sir James Mackintosh, by his son, vol. i. p. 170.

moment, it would, if proposed by the government with the King's support, have probably obtained the consent of Parliament, and the country would have acquiesced in the change almost without knowing what had been done. By its repression, the civilisation of Ireland was retarded for a quarter of a century; and, after all, the settlement of the Irish Roman Catholic Church, which Mr. Pitt designed to effect, has not been accomplished. We hold, therefore, that Mr. Pitt correctly estimated the importance of the question upon which he resigned office. But in order fully to justify the step which he took, when he found that he was betrayed by some of his colleagues, and that the consent of the King could not be obtained, two conditions were, it appears to us, necessary. First, that he should be prepared consistently to act upon the policy of bringing the greatest amount of parliamentary pressure to bear upon the King, with a view of compelling him to readmit a Pittite Ministry to office without any restriction as to the Catholic Question.\* Secondly, that, in the event of the King's resistance being forcibly overcome, he should be in a position which would enable him to use all the influence of Government for carrying this question, and to postpone all other considerations to its success. How far Mr. Pitt had formed a fixed resolution to attempt the fulfilment of these two conditions, his subsequent conduct speedily evinced.

Mr. Pitt's resignation, after an administration of more than seventeen years, was completed without any oral communication between himself and the King. It was accepted by the King on the 5th of February, and the Addington Cabinet was provisionally formed. But before the outgoing Ministers had their audiences to deliver up their seals, the King, in consequence of the mental agitation produced by the ministerial change, was, for the first time since 1788, seized with an attack of insanity.

---

\* Mr. Fox anticipated that this would be the effect of Mr. Pitt's resignation, without any ulterior pressure. In a letter to Lord Holland of Feb. 8. 1801, he says:—'If the Speaker is employed, as is said, to make a new arrangement, it must be indeed a notorious juggle, and it seems to me not unlikely that it will proceed thus. The Speaker will converse with some men of consequence, possibly Grey, or others, and will report that he cannot find it practicable to make a Ministry upon the principle of rejecting the Catholic claims, &c., and then Pitt will be restored, and the King will submit.' (Mem. of Fox, vol. iii. p. 188.) See also the remarks in p. 320. 325. Nothing, in truth, less resembled a juggle than this resignation. Pitt took the step reluctantly, and the King preferred Addington to Pitt too much to allow the latter a *locus penitentiae*, even when he was willing to return.

His malady manifested itself by evident symptoms on the 20th of February, and before the end of the month his life was in danger; but soon after the beginning of March, he began to recover, and by the 10th of the month his mental and bodily health was sufficiently restored to enable him to sign documents and to give audiences to some of his Ministers. During this interval Mr. Pitt acted as Minister, and had interviews with the Prince of Wales and Mr. Addington, for the purpose of discussing the question of a Regency. It seems that the King, on recovering from his attack, ordered Dr. Willis to inform Mr. Pitt of his convalescence; adding the remark, 'What has he not to answer for, who is the cause of my being ill at all?' This remark was repeated to Pitt, and produced from him a contrite letter to the King, offering to abandon the Catholic Question.\* Already, he was not only willing, but desirous to recede from the ground which he had taken, and to remain, upon the terms dictated by the King, at the head of the administration. But he refused, in spite of the entreaties of friends, to make any forward motion in this direction; he wished that the offer should proceed from the King, and that Addington should spontaneously withdraw from his new position. Addington, on the other hand, secure of the royal favour, declined to make any concession, or afford any facility for Mr. Pitt's return, without the previous signification of the King's desire. He added, characteristically enough, that 'they (*i.e.* Mr. Pitt's friends) might open the matter to the King if they pleased, but he would not propose it; and he trusted they would think fit previously to consult the King's physicians as to the effect which such a proposition might have upon His Majesty in his present state of health.' Hereupon Mr. Pitt put an end to the negotiation, and declared himself prepared to support the newly formed government. The King probably knew what was in agitation, but no formal representation was made to him on the subject.

Mr. Pitt's conduct, at this crisis, was as unintelligible to those of his contemporaries to whom it was known, as it is to us at present. Mr. Abbot, the confidential friend of Addington, who succeeded him in the speakership, and was in habits of constant intercourse with him, made this entry in his diary:—'It is still a mystery why Mr. Pitt and his colleagues retired upon a

---

\* Lord Malmesbury, vol. iv. p. 31. We learn from Sir Samuel Romilly's Diary, that the physicians who were examined by a Parliamentary Committee in Dec. 1810, during the King's final illness, stated that his insanity in 1801 was caused by Mr. Pitt's resignation, and that this answer was expunged from their evidence before it was presented to the House. (Life of Sir S. Romilly, vol. ii. p. 352.)

‘question which they were not pledged upon to any one, which the Roman Catholics did not desire, and which they can now so readily forego.’ Lord Malmesbury, who lived in intimacy with Pitt’s friends, is equally perplexed by his conduct. We can understand two adequate motives for Pitt’s resignation: one a deep conviction of the importance of his plan, and a belief that, by resigning, he should promote its chances of success; the other, a point of honour, that having authorised Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh to obtain support for the Union from the Catholics, by the promise of ulterior measures of relief, he was bound, if prevented by the King from fulfilling this promise, to retire from power. But neither of these reasons is consistent with his resigning his office in February, because the King refused his consent to the measure of Catholic relief, and his signifying his readiness to resume his office in March, although the King’s consent was still withheld. After the events of 1788, it must be presumed, that Mr. Pitt contemplated the possible effect of a political crisis in deranging the King’s mind. We confess ourselves at a loss to justify, and scarcely even to explain, the course which he pursued. Why, if he was so willing to remain in March, he was so resolved on resigning in February; or why, if he was so resolved upon resigning in February, he was so willing to remain in March; we are equally unable to determine. What made Mr. Pitt’s conduct the less creditable at this conjuncture was, that he signified his readiness to remain, without consulting some of the most important of his former colleagues, and particularly Lord Grenville, by whom this fact was communicated to Mr. Fox. Pitt’s concealment of his change of intention is severely censured by the latter, in several of his recently published letters.\*

After this singular ministerial evolution, Addington and his colleagues were formally installed in their offices, and passed from a provisional into a definitive tenure of power. But in the course of a week there was a fresh alarm, and the King continued in the hands of the Willises till the end of June, when his state was considered to be such as to justify their removal from his person.† However little fitted the King’s mind, at this

---

\* The statement is that Pitt concealed his intention from all his colleagues, except Dundas. (Mem. of Fox, vol. iii. p. 452.; vol. iv. pp. 14. 20. 22.) ‘Lord Grenville confirmed to me the extraordinary fact of Pitt never having told him of his offer to continue without Catholic Emancipation, in the year 1801.’ (Letter of April 19. 1804, ib. p. 45.)

† Lord Malmesbury’s Diaries, ib. p. 49.; Twiss’s Life of Lord Eldon, vol. i. p. 374–83.; Memorials of Fox, vol. iii. p. 337, 338. 342. In a letter to Lord Lauderdale, dated March 15. 1804, Fox says:—‘That



time, might be to undergo the agitation necessary for the discussion of difficult questions of policy, no doubt can exist as to his satisfaction with the compliant and commonplace Minister whom he had brought into power, or as to the relief which he felt at having disengaged himself from the haughty and dictatorial service of Mr. Pitt. 'The King' (he now writes to his favourite) 'is highly gratified at the repeated marks of the sensibility of Mr. Addington's heart, which must greatly add to the comfort of having placed him, with so much propriety, at the head of the Treasury. He trusts their mutual affection can only cease with their lives.' A few days afterwards he assures Addington of his thorough satisfaction with the new administration. The King likewise confers on his new Minister the endearing epithets of '*my* Chancellor of the Exchequer,' '*my own* Chancellor of the Exchequer;' thereby marking the contrast with his stately and comparatively unbending predecessor.

As soon as the Addington administration were established in office, a negotiation for a separate peace with France was commenced between Lord Hawkesbury, the new Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and M. Otto, a French agent in London, who received his instructions from the First Consul. The negotiation began in March and lasted through the autumn; on the first of October, 1801, the preliminaries of a treaty of peace between Great Britain and France were signed in London; and on the 12th the ratifications of the preliminaries were exchanged. This event was received with an explosion of joy in England; the people were tired of the war, and wished to see it terminated by any reasonable settlement. When Colonel Lauriston, the bearer of the French ratification, set out with M. Otto for Downing Street, the people took the horses from the carriage, and dragged it to the Foreign Office.\* At night all London was illuminated. 'Never, perhaps (says the Annual Register), since the restoration of Charles II., was the general joy in England so high and extravagant. It was in proportion to

---

\* the Ministers will venture everything for their places, I always believed, and it now seems certain. Three years ago, after the King had recovered sufficiently to invest them in their offices, it is known, and now scarcely disavowed, that he had a severe relapse, and was for weeks at Kew, in such a state as neither to see Ministers or family; and yet these very men, from whose timidity so much is expected, ventured to conceal this relapse, and even to deny it, and went on just as if nothing had happened.' (Mem. of Fox, vol. iv. p. 24.)

\* Lord Malmesbury says it was a hackney-coach. (Vol. iv. p. 61.)

‘the sufferings that had been so long endured from the war, and the miserable forebodings arising from a dread of its further continuance.’ At the end of October Parliament was opened, and in the following month the preliminaries were debated in both houses. In the House of Lords, Lord Grenville denounced the arrangement, as not securing one of the objects for which we had so long fought; he regarded the terms as disadvantageous to the country, and fraught with national degradation. The Address, however, was carried by 104 to 10 votes. In the House of Commons the Address was opposed by Mr. Grenville, who, referring to Sheridan’s dictum, that it was a peace at which every man rejoiced, and of which every man was ashamed, said that if Englishmen could rejoice at a bad peace, at a peace of which they could not be proud, the national character was totally lost. Mr. Pitt gave a qualified, but, nevertheless, a decided approbation of the peace. He preferred accepting terms even short of what he thought the country entitled to obtain, to risking the result of the negotiation by too obstinate an adherence to any particular point. Although everything had not been obtained by the preliminaries, yet it did not appear to him, that the difference between those terms and what the country had a right to, was to be compared with the evils which might have resulted by being too peremptory in our demands. He concluded by giving his sincere support to the motion, in which he was joined by Mr. Fox, who declared that, since he had been a member of the House, he never had assented with greater satisfaction to any measure, than he now did to the preliminaries of peace. The preliminaries were condemned by Mr. Windham and Dr. Lawrence, but defended by Mr. Wilberforce, and the Address was agreed to without a division.

A month after the signature of the preliminaries, the Marquis of Cornwallis left England as ambassador, to negotiate the definitive treaty. Having visited Paris, where the First Consul gave him an honourable reception, he repaired to Amiens, the appointed seat of the negotiation. The progress of the treaty did not arrest Bonaparte in the course of foreign aggrandisement which he was pursuing; but the definitive peace was signed on the 27th of March, 1802.\* In the month of May

---

\* An offer of a Cabinet Office was made by Addington to Mr. Grey, about January, 1802, and was declined on the ground that the Ministry could not accede to any measure of Parliamentary Reform. This fact appears in the Fox Correspondence, vol. iii. p. 351. 357. There is no trace of it in the Life of Lord Sidmouth. The pacific policy of the Foxite party doubtless led to this offer.

motions of censure upon the treaty were made in the two Houses of Parliament by Lord Grenville and Mr. Windham; in the House of Lords, the numbers upon the division were 122 to 16 in favour of the Government; in the House of Commons they were 276 to 20. On this occasion Mr. Pitt was absent, but the policy of Ministers was supported by Mr. Sheridan. The feeling of Parliament and the country was still decidedly in favour of the peace; and the *new Opposition* — as they were called — the friends of Lord Grenville and Windham, met with little or no popular support in their disapprobation of the pacific policy of the Addington administration.\*

---

\* Lord Malmesbury seems to have agreed rather with Lord Grenville than with Mr. Pitt in his estimate of the peace. On October 1. 1801, he designates the 'exultation and joy at an event of which the 'issue at best must be doubtful,' as 'childish.' (Diaries, vol. iv. p. 60.) On March 26. 1802 (the day before the signing of the definitive treaty), he met the Duke of York in the streets, who asked him for news. 'Peace, Sir, in a week, and war in a month,' was the answer. This saying was repeated to the King, who, at the next drawing room, told Lord Malmesbury, that he took the same view of the treaty. (Ib. p. 69.) Mr. Fox's views with respect to the peace of Amiens, and its advantage to this country, appear in the following passages: — 'However it may have happened, it is an excellent 'thing, and I do not like it any the worse for its being so very 'triumphant a peace for France, who, except Ancona, does not give 'up any part of her conquests. *Indemnity for the past and security 'for the future* [Mr. Pitt's phrase] are now evidently construed into 'Ceylon and Trinidad. I do not know why you should consider it, 'however, a mere truce; I hope better. The sense of humiliation in 'the Government here will be certainly lost in the extreme popularity 'of the measure. I expect there never was joy more universal and 'unfeigned, and this rascally people are quite overjoyed at receiving 'from Ministers what, if they had dared to ask it, could not have 'been refused them at almost any period of the war.' (To Mr. Maitland, 1801, vol. iii. p. 345.) 'In regard to the public opinion upon 'the subject, my belief is that there never was more genuine and 'general joy upon any public event. I know that in London, and I 'heard too in Liverpool, there are some who abuse it; but in general 'it is far otherwise. Even those who are most dissatisfied only say 'that every gentleman is against it, and every blackguard for it.' (To Mr. Grey, October 12. 1801, ib. p. 347.) 'I fear that whatever 'happens, I cannot with propriety be absent from the House of Commons on the day when the peace makes the regular subject; and so 'I shall have two days instead of one, which is in itself bad enough, 'besides the increased chance of saying indiscreet things, which I 'feel to be very great; for the truth is, I am gone something further 'in hate to the English Government than perhaps you and the rest of 'my friends are, and certainly further than can with prudence be

Much delay took place in renewing the regular diplomatic intercourse between the two countries. Although the Definitive Treaty was signed in March, Gen. Andr  ossy, the French ambassador, did not arrive in England till the 6th of November, nor did Lord Whitworth, appointed to the embassy at Paris, sail for France till the 10th of the same month. Addington, however, had lost no time in putting the establishments of the country upon a footing of peace. The army and navy estimates for the next year showed a reduction of more than 10,000,000*l.*, compared with the expenditure of the last year of war. The income-tax, which Addington, in common with all the statesmen of that period, regarded exclusively as a war-tax, was repealed; the total annual saving of expenditure was estimated by him at 25,000,000*l.*; but a loan of 10,000,000*l.* was announced on the part of the year's finance.

In judging the Peace of Amiens with the light afforded by a knowledge of subsequent events, it is difficult to put ourselves in the contemporary position from which alone a fair estimate of its policy can be formed. But we confess that we agree with those who considered its terms more advantageous to the country than a continuance of the war. If the treaty had led to a permanent pacification between France and England, the acceptance of its terms by the British Government, notwithstanding M. Thiers's opinion of the advantages which it secured to France, would have been, in our judgment, fully justifiable. The true question however is, whether any lasting peace with France, whatever might be its conditions, was possible so long as Bonaparte was the chief ruler. Addington seems to have believed in the moderation of Bonaparte, and in the sincerity of his desire for peace. How far such a belief was at that time reasonable, is uncertain; but that it was utterly false, and that no treaty which could then have been made between the two countries would have restrained the ambition of the First Consul, or have prevented him from rendering the renewal of the war inevitable, few will now be inclined to doubt.

It may, however, be interesting to compare the confidential opinions which the statesmen who represented the extreme warlike and pacific parties respectively, expressed on the subject about this time. Lord Grenville, writing to his brother in May,

'avowed. The triumph of the French Government over the English 'does in fact afford me a degree of pleasure which it is very difficult 'to disguise.' (To Mr. Grey, Oct. 22. 1801, *ib.* p. 349.) It is impossible not to regret that Mr. Fox's long exclusion from office should have so far soured his mind as to lead him to indulge the feelings which are expressed in some of these passages.

1801, before the signature of the preliminaries, thus states his views of Bonaparte's policy:—

‘I certainly agree with you in thinking that Bonaparte has not the most remote idea of peace, but looks to the continuance of the war as his only salvation. Indeed, unless he can find a pretence to plunder Portugal, and perhaps Spain too, the machine of his government cannot go on, now that requisitions in Germany and Italy are at an end. I could bring a thousand little circumstances, which the long habit of watching that nest of robbers and assassins, called the French Government, teaches me to look to as decisive proof that their intentions, at this moment, are entirely warlike.’\*

Again, in another letter to his brother, of Oct. 26. 1803, written about six months after the rupture of the peace, he says:—

‘I have received information, from which I collect that there is some disposition to hazard in both Houses, from our side of the way, certain recommendations in favour of negotiations for peace; and I cannot reconcile to myself to leave my utter disapprobation of all such language to be guessed at, merely from my absence.

‘Peace I desire most fervently: no person in the country, I am sure, desires it more than I do; and few have had such opportunities of knowing how necessary it is to us. But then I am confident that there is no hope of peace for Europe, or for England, but by raising up some sufficient barrier against Bonaparte's ambition, which aims at universal empire, not in the figurative, but in the most literal acceptation of those terms. This great work, I have long been convinced, could not be accomplished but by the union of the three great continental Powers. That the insolence of France would ultimately produce this union, I firmly believed; and until it took place I was always averse to wasting the resources of this country in separate and therefore ineffectual exertions. But now that this union is formed, and that these Powers seem really convinced that they are fighting their own cause, not ours alone, it would, I think, be no less impolitic than disgraceful for this country to be the first to hold such language, or to take such steps as may lead to the separation of the alliance.

‘I am not so sanguine as many are in my hopes of success, because I well know how much there is to do; but God forbid that I should persuade this country to desert the cause of Europe so long as there is any chance—and such there certainly now is—that Europe will fight for its own independence.’†

On the other hand, Mr. Fox, in November, 1802, about nine months after the signature of the Definitive Treaty, expresses an opinion that Bonaparte ‘will do everything that he can to

\* To the Marquis of Buckingham, May 26. 1801, *Court and Cabinets*, vol. iii. p. 160.

† *Court and Cabinets*, vol. iii. p. 331.

‘avoid war;’\* and in the following month, he says, ‘I am obstinate in my opinion that Bonaparte’s wish is for peace—nay, that he is afraid of war to the last degree.’† His views on Bonaparte’s position and policy are further developed in a letter written at the same time.

‘My notion about Bonaparte’s politics is this.—that when I first went to Paris he was foolishly sore about our newspapers, but not ill disposed to the Ministers, and still less to the country. At this time he was out of humour with Austria, and determined, as I suspect, not to give way a little to her. Afterwards, when he suspected (whether truly or falsely) that we should interfere, he began to be terribly afraid of a war, which might in France be imputed to his rashness. In consequence of this fear, he did make concessions by no means inconsiderable to Austria, and immediately felt bitter against us who were the cause of his making them. But as that bitterness (according to my hypothesis) arises principally from the fear he has of our driving him into an unpopular war, I do not think it will for the present prevent peace; nor indeed, if pacific counsels and language are used here, that it is at all likely [not?] to be lasting. . . . . Whatever ridicule may be attempted to be thrown upon the title of pacificator, you may be sure that whatever hold he has (perhaps no great matter neither) upon the people of France, arises from the opinion that he alone could make the peace, and that he will be the best able to maintain it.’‡

Mr. Horner has the following entry in his journal, under the date of January, 1806:—

‘Mr. Fox was of opinion, before the commencement of the present war, that the real intentions and wishes of Bonaparte, however hostile he was to this country, were to make his subjects a commercial people; to keep his own power, of course, as absolute as possible; but to reduce the military spirit and system to which he originally owed it.’§

During the session of 1802, Mr. Pitt absented himself from Parliament.¶ Though, on the whole, he approved of the peace,

\*. To Lord Lauderdale, Nov. 12. 1802. *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 372.

†. To Mr. Grey, Dec. 12. 1802, *ib.* p. 384.

‡. To Mr. Grey, Dec. 1802, *ib.* p. 381–2. Mr. Fox went to France in July, 1802, and came back to England in November. He returns to his idea of Bonaparte’s pacific disposition in Sept. 1803: ‘I feel quite sure that Bonaparte would like peace if we would give way in anything.’ (*Ib.* vol. iv. p. 116.)

§. *Life of Horner*, vol. i. p. 323.

¶ Mr. Fox, in a letter of Dec. 19. 1802, says, that although Pitt is supposed to be friendly to peace, the war-party are constantly calling for his return to power; and ‘therefore he will find himself obliged, after Christmas, to say something pretty decisive, or to make his retirement (for a time at least) a complete secession.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 206.)

he was dissatisfied with the general course of the administration; and he reconciled these two feelings by maintaining a neutral station; he discontinued his active support to the Government, but did not commence a declared opposition to its measures. The ambiguous state of his mind was known to his friends: and accordingly, near the end of the year (November, 1802), an attempt was made by some of the more eager of his followers to force or induce Addington to resign, in order that Pitt might succeed to his place. A paper was drawn up by Mr. Canning, for presentation to Mr. Addington, the object of which was to bring about this substitution by voluntary means. Both Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville were now prepared to abstain from pressing the Catholic Question upon the King, and to accept office without making this measure an indispensable condition. Pitt himself thought the change desirable; but would not consent to any active steps being taken by his friends, or any canvass being made: he deprecated anything which could bear the appearance of a plot or cabal; maintained that if he stood aloof, an alteration in his opinions would be inferred, and if there was a general wish to restore him to office, it would soon be manifested. The result of this discouragement was that Mr. Canning's paper was suppressed\*, and that no active movement for Pitt's restoration to power had been made when the session for the ensuing year commenced in November, 1802. Pitt absolutely rejected any attempt to force him upon the King through a parliamentary motion; and in this view Mr. Canning himself concurred.†

The Opposition at this time consisted of two sections, the Old and the New. The old Opposition, composed of Mr. Fox and his few remaining followers, had strongly supported the peace;

\* See Lord Malmesbury's Diaries, vol. iv. p. 80-127.

† Lord Malmesbury, *ib.* p. 117. 145. There is in Mr. Fox's Correspondence a letter to Mr. Adair, dated simply 1802, in which allusion is made to some offer to Pitt with the King's consent; the report resting on the authority of the Prince of Wales, but having been heard by Fox from other quarters (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 883.). There is no trace of any such offer in Lord Malmesbury's Diaries, although he was in intimate and frequent communication with Mr. Canning and with Mr. Pitt himself at this time. It is highly improbable that any proposal should have been made by Addington to Pitt to join his Government, either with or without the King's consent, in the course of 1802. In a letter to Mr. Grey, of Dec. 12. 1802, Mr. Fox says: 'The King is supposed to be full as unwilling to restore Pitt as ever; and indeed, from his nature, I am sure it must be so.' (*Ib.* p. 386.)

the new Opposition, formed of the Grenville party, had as strongly condemned it. The restlessness of Bonaparte, and the improbability of maintaining pacific relations with France, began now to manifest themselves; and public opinion gradually inclined towards the new Opposition, who had from the commencement censured the treaty, and predicted its failure. For the same reason, the general feeling pointed to Mr. Pitt's resumption of office. The chief title of the Addington administration to confidence and support was the peace: if the peace should prove a failure, their principal hold on the good wishes of the public was gone: and if vigour and ability for the prosecution of war were needed, the superiority of Pitt seemed undeniable. These considerations did not fail to present themselves, in some form or other, to the mind of Mr. Addington; and induced him to entertain the idea of strengthening the Ministry by the incorporation of his predecessor.

Mr. Pitt, in his way from Bath to London in December, 1802, visited Lord Malmesbury at Park Place, and Lord Grenville at Dropmore. At the former house, in answer to the remonstrances of Lord Malmesbury with respect to his inaction, he declared himself in favour of a pacific policy; he thought that the great question then under deliberation was, *how to bear and to forbear*: that if peace could be preserved for four or five years, our revenues would be so far improved that we might again face such a war as was just ended; and that nothing but a gross national insult, or an open act of hostility, or such an attempt at aggrandisement on the part of France as would in effect comprise both, ought to divert us from this course.\* The result of Mr. Pitt's visit to Dropmore is preserved in a letter from Lord Grenville to his brother.† He was better in health and spirits; his opinions were more alienated from the Government: although disposed to treat them with the utmost tenderness, he was prepared to attend Parliament after the Christmas recess, and to make his sentiments known to the world. On his way through London to Walmer, Mr. Pitt (much to Mr. Canning's annoyance) made two visits to Addington, at his house in Richmond Park.‡ The conversation which passed between Pitt and Addington at this time was considered by the latter 'extremely

\* Lord Malmesbury, *ib.* p. 152-7.

† Court and Cabinets, vol. iii. p. 242. The dates and places are mistaken by the editor, p. 241., who represents Pitt as visiting Lord Grenville after he had been to Addington.

‡ This was the White Lodge, to which, after it had been conferred on Addington by the King, Mr. Canning gave the name of the 'Villa Medici.' Lord Sidmouth retained it till his death in 1844.



‘comfortable and satisfactory.’ Addington took occasion to sound him on the subject of his return to office, and received from the great ex-minister an answer which he deemed encouraging.\*

The months of February and March, 1803, which Mr. Pitt passed at Walmer, brought the relations with France to a crisis. On the 8th of March, a message from the Crown, pointing to military preparations in France and Holland, and to pending discussions with France, the result of which was uncertain, and recommending to Parliament the adoption of precautionary measures, was brought down to both Houses. Addresses in answer to this message, which was regarded as the signal of renewed war, were unanimously voted both by Lords and Commons: the Government proposed the embodiment of the militia, and an addition of 10,000 seamen to the navy. From these debates Mr. Pitt was absent. Mr. Fox gave an unwilling support to a warlike Address, and Mr. Francis commented upon the exclusion of the whole ability of the nation from the existing counsels of the sovereign. The message of the 8th of March gave rise to the celebrated explosion of Bonaparte, at a public reception at the Tuileries, on the 13th, when he upbraided Lord Whitworth with the supposed desire of his country to revive the war, and their alleged infraction of the treaty. In this state of things, with the prospect of being driven from his pacific policy, and being compelled to play the part of a War Minister, Addington lost no time in seeking the assistance of Pitt.

Before the end of March Lord Melville went down to Walmer, the bearer of a message from Addington, announcing his willingness to form a junction with Pitt. The scheme originally proposed to Mr. Pitt was, that Mr. Addington and himself should be Secretaries of State (or, if Mr. Pitt preferred, that he should be Chancellor of the Exchequer), with a third person, agreeable to him, as Prime Minister, it being intended that this person should be Lord Chatham. Mr. Pitt instantly rejected this overture, chiefly on the ground that the proposed arrangement, by which the First Minister would not be the most important person in the Government, was objectionable. Addington understood this objection to mean that Pitt insisted on being himself Prime Minister, and thereupon sent him, by Mr. Long, a verbal message to the effect that he might resume his former offices, and Addington would be a Secretary of State. Pitt acceded to the wish for a meeting with Addington, after Easter, which was at the same time expressed, but declined

---

\* Life of Lord Sidmouth, vol. ii. p. 113.

to give any assurance as to his own course without further explanations. At this stage of the negotiation Lord Grenville arrived at Walmer on a visit, and received from Pitt a full account of what had passed. Pitt likewise inquired of him whether he and his friends would form part of a Government formed by himself, and ascertained Lord Grenville's feelings on this subject. The meeting between Pitt and Addington took place in the early part of April, at Mr. Long's house at Bromley Hill. At this conference Pitt stated that the entire administration must be remodelled, and that Lord Grenville, Lord Melville, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Windham must be members of it. As soon as Addington received this ultimatum, he perceived that there was an irreconcilable antagonism between his views and those of Pitt. He wished to strengthen his own Ministry, by engrafting Pitt into it, or, if necessary, by placing Pitt at its head. Pitt wished to form a Ministry of his own, out of new materials, adopting only, from motives of private friendship and from deference to the King, some portions of the existing Cabinet. Addington made an attempt by letter, before he submitted the plan to his colleagues, to obtain better terms; but Pitt declined to alter his resolution. The proposal was then laid before the Cabinet, who, as might be expected, refused to be parties to a step which was a virtual dissolution of the Government. Their refusal was communicated by Addington to Pitt, who returned a simple acknowledgment of the letter. Some further explanatory correspondence between them ensued, which ended by Pitt's requesting that all the letters might be laid before the King.\* It appears that the King's consent to the

---

\* An accurate and complete knowledge of this ministerial negotiation may be obtained by a comparison of Lord Sidmouth's *Life*, vol. ii. pp. 113-30.; Lord Malmesbury, *ib.* pp. 176-88.; and Lord Grenville's *Narrative, Court and Cabinets*, vol. iii. pp. 282-90. An authentic account of the transaction, from information made public at the time, is also given in ch. 17. of the *Annual Register* for 1803. In Lord Grenville's *Narrative* the words, 'He (Pitt) desired Mr. Long to add, that 'he should *put* himself at liberty to communicate what had already passed 'to some of his friends; and particularly to myself' (p. 280.), ought apparently to be, 'he should *feel* himself at liberty.' Mr. Wilberforce represents this plan as having originated with Lord Melville, and as having been carried into effect by him. 'Dundas undertook to bring 'Pitt into the plan, which was to appoint some third person head, and 'bring in Pitt and Addington on equal terms under him. Dundas accordingly, confiding in his knowledge of all Pitt's ways and feelings, 'set out for Walmer Castle; and after dinner and port wine, began 'cautiously to open his proposals. But he saw it would not do, and 'stopped abruptly. "Really," said Pitt, with a sly severity, — and it

negotiation, however necessary an element in the business, had never been procured by Addington; so that, in fact, no distinct offer, by competent authority, was made to Pitt. Addington assumed to act as plenipotentiary, but had not full powers to treat. The consequence was, that unless he induced Pitt to assent to the precise proposal which he made, and which the Cabinet were likely to ratify, the negotiation could not lead to a successful issue. Looking to Pitt's experience and sagacity, and to Addington's dependence on the King, it is remarkable that the latter should have ventured to make the offer, or that the former should have been willing to entertain it, without the King's express authority being previously obtained. It was not a mere question of changing a Cabinet office, as to which a Prime Minister might properly make a preliminary arrangement, subject to the King's confirmation. It was practically a negotiation for a complete alteration of the character of the Government; and the whole discussion proceeded on the assumption that Addington and Pitt were between them to settle who was to be the new Prime Minister.

Addington's first communication to the King on the subject is stated by Lord Malmesbury to have been made at an audience after the levee, when Pitt's final answer had been given, and the correspondence was nearly terminated. He represented Pitt's conduct in such colours as to rouse the King's wrath; who talked of Pitt's 'putting the crown in commission;' and said that he carried his plan of removals so far and so high, that it might end in reaching himself. A short time afterwards Addington gave the King copies of the correspondence, but the King refused to read the letters, or to take any notice of them, adding that 'it was a foolish business, which was begun ill, conducted ill, and terminated ill.'

It soon appeared that the hopes of averting the war, which Addington had weakly cherished up to the last moment, were destined to be but short lived. On the 16th of May a message from the Crown was delivered to the two Houses, informing them

---

'was almost the only sharp thing I ever heard him say of any friend, "I had not the curiosity to ask what I was to be."'—(Life of Wilberforce, vol. iii. p. 219.) This is a remarkable instance of the manner in which historical truth is unintentionally perverted for the sake of conversational antithesis. It is certain that Addington's message was fully delivered to Pitt, that it was deliberately considered by him, and that he gave a written answer to it, in which his reasons for refusing the offer were stated at length. Mr. Wilberforce, who disliked Fox's character and politics, and thought the Grenvilles too warlike, desired to see a union between Pitt and Addington effected. (Ib. p. 156.)

that the King had recalled his ambassador from Paris, and that the French ambassador had left London. A declaration of war by England was issued on the 18th. Papers explanatory of the rupture were presented; and an Address was moved by Ministers pledging Parliament to the renewal of hostilities. Public opinion, which two years before had been so strongly pronounced in favour of peace, was now equally decided in favour of war. The majority for the Address was in the Lords 142 to 10; in the Commons 398 to 67. Pitt appeared on this occasion, and spoke with great energy in support of a warlike policy. Fox made one of his most successful efforts in favour of pacific relations with France.\* 'Everybody here seems to be of one mind (says Mr. Horner, in a letter written at the time) as to the justice of the war in respect of the case, as we lawyers call it, that this country can make out against Bonaparte; but the

---

\* Fox's own account of this debate is as follows:—'Pitt's speech was admired very much, and very justly. I think it was the best he ever made in that style; and there were several circumstances that rendered it peculiarly popular with the House. I dare say you have heard puffs enough of my speech upon the Address, so that I need not add my mite; but the truth is, it was my best.' (Mem. of Fox, *ib.* p. 223.) 'In the debate Mr. Fox spoke from ten to one; and in these three hours delivered a speech of more art, eloquence, wit, and mischief, than I ever remember to have heard from him.' (Abbot's Diary, in Lord Sidmouth's Life, *ib.* p. 182.) 'Pitt's speech on the 23rd, the finest he ever made—never was any speech so cheered, or such incessant and loud applause; it was strong in support of war, but he was silent as to Ministers; and his silence, either as to blame or praise, was naturally construed into negative censure.' (Lord Malmesbury, *ib.* p. 256.) 'Fox spoke three hours, very ingeniously, but very mischievous. Windham answered him. Addington spoke very poorly.' (P. 257.) Mr. Horner's report will also be read with interest:—'By all the accounts I have collected, both Pitt and Fox made a very great display. Pitt's peroration was a complete half hour of his most powerful declamation, not lowered in its tone for a moment; not a particle of all this is preserved in the report lately published, though said to be done by Canning. Fox's speech was quite of a different cast, and not at all in the tone which he usually adopts; no high notes, no impassioned bursts; but calm, subtle, argumentative pleasantries. He very seldom attempts to keep the House laughing; but in this speech, I understand, it was evidently his design throughout, and Mackintosh says he never heard so much wit. A good many of the points are repeated, none of which are in the newspapers, but I cannot pretend to give you them. I remember, however, the compliment he paid to Pitt's speech, that "if Demosthenes had been present, he must have admired, and might have envied."' (Memoirs of Horner, vol. i. p. 221.)

‘policy of war at the present juncture is a different question, of which people take various views.’\*

The only step now taken by Mr. Fox in assertion of his pacific policy, was to move an Address to the Crown, recommending a resort to the mediation of Russia, in order to re-establish peace with France; Mr. Pitt concurred in the principles of the motion, and it was not pressed to a division.†

Shortly afterwards, resolutions censuring Ministers for their submissive conduct towards France since the signature of the peace, and expressing a want of confidence in them, were proposed in both Houses, and negatived by large majorities. In the Commons, the motion for the removal of Ministers, made by Col. Patten, was chiefly memorable on account of the line which was taken by Mr. Pitt. Their conduct had been condemned in several elaborate speeches, chiefly from members of the Grenville party, and it had been defended by Addington; when Pitt rose to deliver his opinion. The Opposition at this time, consisting as it did of two sections, was weakened by difference of sentiment. The old Opposition regretted the renewal of the war; the new Opposition applauded its renewal, and only regretted the peace by which it had been for a time interrupted. The policy of the Government had failed, and

---

\* *Memoirs of Horner*, ib. p. 219.

† The views entertained by Mr. Fox at this time, with respect to the chances of maintaining the peace of Amiens, and the causes of its rupture, may be collected from the following passages in his letters:—  
 ‘Everybody seems to think that peace is more and more safe; but yet what you say of ambiguous menaces, which is applicable to both sides, bad blood, &c., is very true, and till a language more friendly is adopted on both sides, there can be no safety: this is what I will work at as well as I can.’ (To Lord Holland, Jan. 1. 1803. *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 210.) ‘Everybody now sees that Bonaparte’s wish is for peace; nay, even the most warlike say he does not yet think himself ready. Everybody, too, now sees there was no violence on the part of France (which was at first supposed to cause the message), and I believe all indignant feelings are subsided, and the wish for peace as general as ever.’ (The same, March 29. 1803, ib. p. 219.) ‘You know I have no great expectations of the gratitude of the country; but yet the wish for peace among sober-minded people is so general and so strong, that I cannot help thinking we should, in the feel of the country at least, be honourably distinguished from the other politicians and parties of the day, who so evidently make war and peace mere engines of attack upon a Ministry whom they dislike.’ (To Mr. Grey, March 12. 1803, p. 297.) ‘At present I am more convinced than ever, that, if it is war, it is entirely the fault of the Ministers, and not of Bonaparte.’ (The same, March 1803, ib. p. 404.)

Ministers were admitted to be wanting in ability and vigour. If Mr. Pitt cordially approved of the conduct of Ministers, the immediate strength derived from his support, and the prospect of a more intimate connexion hereafter, would probably place them in a position which, backed by the King's influence, would defy all hostile attacks. On the other hand, if he gave a decided assent to the vote of want of confidence, it was plain that, whatever might be the numbers in the division, his open junction with the two sections of Oppositions would speedily force Addington to a capitulation. The curiosity therefore as to the sentiments which he would express, and the vote which he would give, was great. But the hopes of all parties were doomed to be disappointed. He declared that he could bestow neither approbation nor censure upon the conduct of Ministers; that he saw no such extraordinary exigency as justified a parliamentary interference for their removal, and that he could neither affirm nor negative the Address. He therefore moved that the House should pass to the other orders of the day without coming to a vote upon the resolutions. Lord Hawkesbury followed Mr. Pitt, and, on the part of the Government, rejected the proffered compromise, insisting that the House should decide for a direct censure, or a total acquittal. Mr. Canning announced that though he had never hitherto voted against the opinion of Mr. Pitt, he must support the resolutions. The question was then put; when there appeared for Mr. Pitt's motion 58, against it, 333. The minority was the exact measure of Mr. Pitt's followers in this division, as both sections of the Opposition voted with the Government. After this division Mr. Pitt, with his friends, and the old Opposition, went away; and upon the main question the numbers were, for the resolutions 36, against them 277; this minority consisting of the new Opposition.

The conduct of Mr. Pitt, though deemed feeble by Lord Grenville\*, condemned as factious by the King, and considered an error in parliamentary tactics by his own friends, probably answered his object. Having voted for the peace, and having for some time supported Addington, he was unwilling to join in

---

\* In the intercepted letter from Lord Grenville to Lord Wellesley (written soon after this debate), Pitt's proceeding is thus characterised:—'The measure which he has lately adopted (I allude to his motion of adjournment on the vote of censure, illjudged in itself, as I think it was, and unfortunate in its result, since it lessened his public influence) has at least the merit of expressing, in an unequivocal manner, his disapprobation of the conduct of Government.' (*Annual Register*, vol. xlv. p. 118.)

the vote of censure; but by refusing to negative it, he implied his disapprobation of Ministers, and evinced a disposition which could not fail soon to break out into open hostility.

No further attempt was made during the session to place the administration in different hands. Addington proceeded without delay to restore the army and navy to a war footing, and to re-impose the income tax,—the objection being taken then, as subsequently, that it made no distinction between permanent and precarious incomes. His Ministry had now lived through three sessions. In the first, he negotiated; in the second, he concluded the peace; in the third, he declared war. The pacification lasted from the signing of the preliminaries, in October, 1801, till the recall of Lord Whitworth, in May, 1803; a period of twenty months.

But although the Ministry had reached the close of the session, and stood high in the royal favour, the course of events had destroyed all their prominent claims to popular support. It was evident that the beginning of their end had arrived. Mediocrity was in all things their characteristic. They were considered a middle-class Ministry; and their weakness in the House of Lords was more striking than in the House of Commons. Moderate in measures, as in ability\*, they hoped to succeed by bending before circumstances, and to obtain safety in the midst of storms by their resemblance to the reed rather than to the oak. They likewise flattered themselves that good intentions would supply the want of vigorous acts. But a new state of things had arisen, and positive qualifications in a Ministry were now felt to be necessary. Pitt's protecting arm, which

---

\* The first stanza of Canning's song of 'Moderate Men and Moderate Measures,' runs thus:—

'Praise to placcless, proud ability  
 Let the prudent muse disclaim;  
 And sing the statesman—all civility—  
 Whom moderate talents raise to fame.  
 He, no random projects urging,  
 Makes us wild alarms to feel;  
 With moderate measures gently purging  
 'Ills that prey on Britain's weal.'

Lord Holland says of Addington:—'His empty and pompous manner exposed him to ridicule; and old Lord Liverpool justly observed that he was laughed out of power and place by the *beau monde*.' (Mem. of the Whig Party, vol. ii. p. 211.) It seems to us that it was the wits, rather than the *beau monde*, who made Addington ridiculous. Addington was indeed the favourite of the Court; but it must be confessed that the Court at this time was not *in fashion*. \*

had been for a time held over Addington's head, was now about to turn the sword against his breast.\* The Grenville party had never joined in Addington's support, and since the announcement of the preliminaries, had kept up an active, unsparing, and determined opposition. Fox and his friends had warmly supported the treaty and the pacific policy of the Government; but the war had now been resumed, and in January, 1804, an overture was made to him by the Grenvilles to join in a systematic opposition for the purpose of removing the Ministry, and substituting one formed on a wide and comprehensive basis. This overture was accepted, and the old and new Oppositions, as they were called, were thus combined in common action against Addington. Fox, indeed, as late as November, 1803, had been using his best exertions in Addington's support, for the purpose of keeping out Pitt; but his language with respect to Ministers, soon after this time, which he used in his private letters, was contemptuous and hostile in the highest degree.†

---

\* 'Pitt, I hear, is more and more bitter against the Ministers, and feels strongly what he deems the embarrassment of his situation. I am told he even expresses this sentiment (an openness not very usual with him) to some of his friends.' (Mr. Fox to Mr. Grey, Dec. 17. 1803; Mem. of Fox, vol. iii. p. 443.) Lord Grenville made to Pitt, in January, the same offer which he made to Fox; but Pitt refused to engage with others in any systematic opposition to Addington. Lord Grenville reports the result of his interview with Pitt in a letter to his brother, of Jan. 30. 1804:—'The same ideas prevail, and nearly the same course will be pursued. The most decided hatred and contempt of those who have done so much to provoke both, but views of middle lines, and managements, and delicacies *où l'on se perd*.' (Court and Cabinets, vol. iii. p. 342.) Pitt's own detailed explanation of his conduct at this time, as given in a long conversation with Lord Malmesbury, may be seen in the Diary of the latter, vol. iv. p. 288-92.

† 'I really think the next six weeks must bring matters to a crisis, both with respect to the King, and to the getting rid of these rascals.' (Mr. Fox to Mr. Grey, April 2. (misprinted August), 1804. Mem. of Fox, vol. iii. p. 459.) 'Let us first get rid of the Doctor, is my first principle of action, in which I reckon you as concurring with me as much as any one.' (Mr. Fox to Mr. Grey, April 13., ib. p. 463.) 'You will perceive that the Doctor is much weaker in numbers than one could have imagined; but it looks as if this was not so much owing to our strength, as to speculations among their friends concerning the King, and Pitt's ambiguous situation. However, it has this good effect, that it makes him (the Doctor) more and more condemned every day; indeed the contempt, both with respect to the degree and universality of it, is beyond what was ever known. Not one unpaid defender, unless you reckon Dallas, who is impatient for



At the beginning of 1804, the course of political affairs was again disturbed by a recurrence of the King's malady. As on the last occasion, his life was for a time in danger; but when his bodily health was restored, the mental derangement was such that the appointment of a Regent came seriously into question. The attention of Parliament was awakened; but after some weeks the bulletins ceased, and Ministers declared that no necessity existed for the suspension of the regal functions. It is however certain that during a large part of this year, the King's mind was in a state which disqualified him for the calm and attentive consideration of important political questions.\* We need scarcely point out that this incapacity rendered negotiations for the reconstruction of the Government difficult; that it tended to make parliamentary opposition for the purpose of compelling the King to acquiesce in a policy which he disliked, objectionable on the score of feeling, and thus gave an undue advantage to the Ministers in possession of office.† The painful and conflicting considerations which the

---

'the Solicitor-Generalship.' (Mr. Fox to Lord Lauderdale, March 15., *ib.* vol. iv. p. 24.) 'The Doctor has exceeded, if possible, all his former lies in what he said about the Russian business. It is, I own, 'an ignoble chase; but I should have great pleasure in hunting down 'this vile fellow.' (Mr. Fox to Lord Lauderdale, March 25., *ib.* p. 31.) Within two years this 'vile fellow,' however, held the office of Lord Privy Seal in Mr. Fox's own administration.

\* See Twiss's *Life of Lord Eldon*, vol. i. p. 416-27. 446. 452.; *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. ii. p. 246-50.; *Lord Malmesbury*, *ib.* p. 286. 291. 310, 311, 318.; *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iii. p. 453. 463., vol. iv. p. 24. The following anecdote of the acuteness which the King retained in the midst of his mental derangement, is related on this occasion by Lord Malmesbury:—'In the first illness, when Willis, who 'was a clergyman, entered the room, the King asked him if he, who 'was a clergyman, was not ashamed of himself exercising such a profession. "Sir," said Willis, "our Saviour himself went about healing the sick." "Yes," answered the King, "but he had not 700*l.* a year for it." (*Ib.* p. 310.). Another similar anecdote is related in the *Life of Lord Eldon*:—'The King, during one of his illnesses, complained to Lord Eldon, who related the story to Mr. Farrer, that a 'man in the employ of some of his physicians had knocked him down. "When I got up again," added the King, "I said my foot had slipped, 'and ascribed my fall to that; it would not do for me to admit that 'the King had been knocked down by any one.'" (*Twiss*, *ib.* p. 426.)

† 'The truth seems to be that the moment the Doctor found that the King's madness took the turn of wishing war against Bonaparte, he was determined to humour that on which his sole existence depended, viz., the King's madness.' (Mr. Fox to Lord Lauderdale, April 2. 1804. *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iv. p. 36.)

King's illness suggested, may be understood from the following passage in a letter from Lord Grenville to the Marquis of Buckingham, of April 19th, 1804. \*Lord Grenville, after informing his brother of a message from Pitt to Addington, involving a communication to the King respecting a change of Ministry, proceeds thus: —

‘You will observe all this supposes the King in a state to receive such a communication from Addington, and to undergo all the fatigue of body and mind, to which it must unavoidably lead, if even he should be disposed to act at once as reason, policy, and the real interests of himself, his family, and his people require. *I cannot say that I believe him to be equal even to the very first entering upon such a business*; and if the state of public affairs were such as would allow of our postponing the whole question, most willingly would I lend him my assistance (without his knowing that I did so), for warding off from him the difficulties of such a scene. But this I know is impossible. To trust the country for another year, in such times as these, to such management as we are now under, would be, in all reasonable calculation, inevitable ruin; and if, in measuring one's conduct upon such a subject, one could look to the King's health alone, the only possible means of securing his peace of mind, is to do the best for guarding the kingdom against the danger now ready to burst upon us, and which, if not better provided against than they now are, must, when they come, infallibly overthrow his reason in the first instance; but, probably, with that, destroy himself, his family, and his kingdom.’\*

No long time, however, elapsed before Pitt, by independent attacks, and by giving support to the concerted measures of the two oppositions, drove Addington to the necessity of resignation. He commenced his hostile operations before Easter by a motion for papers on the state of the navy, in which he was aided by the Foxites and Grenvilles. Upon this motion, the Prince's friends voted with Ministers, and the Government had a majority of 201 to 130. After Easter, the opposition was continued upon a bill for the augmentation of the Irish militia: on the third reading, when Pitt voted with Fox and the Grenvilles, the ministerial majority was only 21. A week afterwards,

---

\* Court and Cabinets, vol. iii. p. 350. The following is the account of the King's state given by the Prince of Wales, in November, 1804, after a visit to Windsor:—‘He had found things ‘at Windsor as bad as they had been represented; no cordiality ‘(hardly common civility) towards himself; a power of restraining ‘himself and talking rationally for some time and on some points, but ‘no day passing without much of a different description, and many ‘points very prevalent in his mind of a character extremely irrational.’ (Lord Grenville to the Marquis of Buckingham, Nov. 30. 1804. Court and Cabinets, *ib.* p. 381.)

Fox brought forward an opposition motion on the defences of the country, which was supported in debate by Pitt and Windham. In this division, Sheridan and the Prince's friends voted with the Opposition, and the numbers were for the motion, 204, against it 256; showing a majority of 52 for the Government. Two days afterwards, on the 25th of April, 1804, Mr. Pitt followed up this advantage by opposing the order of the day for going into committee on a government bill, for the suspension of the Army of Reserve Act. He objected to the system of military defence proposed by Ministers, and developed a plan of his own. On this question, the division was 240 to 203, leaving a majority of only 37 in favour of Ministers. Taking into consideration the gradual decline in his own numbers, and also the weight of the Opposition, Addington now resolved to resign. He communicated his intention immediately to the King; and on the 30th of April the Chancellor informed Mr. Pitt that the Government was dissolved.

Soon after the division on the third reading of the Irish Militia Bill on the 16th of April, Addington sent a message to Pitt, desiring to know, through a common friend, his opinions on the state of public affairs, and the steps to be taken for carrying on the Government. Pitt, who doubtless bore in mind the unsatisfactory result of the negotiation with Addington in the previous year\*, declined to accede to this proposal; but stated that if the King wished to learn his views as to the formation of a new Ministry, he would state them to any person nominated by His Majesty for that purpose. Addington's reply was that he would advise the King to charge Lord Eldon with this mission.† A few days afterwards Pitt, without receiving any communication from the King, sent to Lord Eldon an unscaled letter to be laid before His Majesty, declaring sentiments adverse

---

\* Fox, in a letter to a Mr. O'Brien, of January 22. 1804, says: 'Depend on it, there is no truth in any treaty at present (I mean these last nine months) with Pitt or for Pitt.' (Mem. of Fox, vol. iv. p. 14.) On which passage Lord J. Russell remarks, that 'Mr. Fox was quite mistaken,' referring to the Life of Lord Sidmouth. Mr. Fox's statement is certainly correct; there had been no negotiation with Pitt since March and April, 1803; and this transaction was well known to Mr. Fox, who says in a letter to Mr. Grey, of April, 1803, 'I have good authority for saying that the negotiation with Pitt is at an end, and in a manner not likely to bring on a renewal.' (Mem. of Fox, vol. iii. p. 410.)

† This transaction was related by Pitt to Lord Grenville. Letter of Lord Grenville to Lord Buckingham, April 19. 1804; Court and Cabinets, vol. iii. p. 348.

to the Government, and explaining the course which he was about to take on Mr. Fox's motion. This letter appears not to have been submitted to the King until about the time when Addington tendered his resignation.\* On the 2nd of May, Mr. Pitt sent through Lord Eldon a letter to the King, containing his plan for the formation of a new Government, which was to comprehend the leaders of all political parties; but the King, who was greatly troubled and disconcerted at Addington's resignation, and was most reluctant to readmit Pitt to office, gave him a discouraging answer.† Mr. Pitt now requested a personal interview. This request was granted, and on the 7th he was accompanied to the Queen's House by the Chancellor; but such were the reports of the King's state which he had heard, that he refused to enter the closet until he had received from the physicians a written assurance that his visit would not disturb the King, especially as His Majesty had not seen him for three years‡; that is, apparently, not since his resignation in 1801. Mr. Pitt, however, found the King capable of discussing public affairs with him. He obtained with some difficulty permission to treat with Lord Grenville and his friends, as well as with the friends of Mr. Fox; but the King positively refused to admit Mr. Fox himself into the Cabinet, although his comprehension was pressed by Pitt.

Pitt received this communication of the King's wishes as final, and made no further attempt to resist them. As soon as the interview was over, he sent Mr. Canning to Lord Grenville, and Lord Granville Leveson to Mr. Fox, to acquaint them with what had passed. Lord Grenville said that the result was what he expected, and he must decline to take office. On the following day, after he had communicated with his friends, he addressed a letter to Mr. Pitt (which was made public at the time), in which he objected to becoming party to a system of Government formed upon a principle of exclusion; and he declared his opinion, that as large a proportion as possible of the weight, talents, and character, to be found in public men of all descriptions, and without any exception, ought to be

---

\* There seems no ground for Lord Brougham's view (*Hist. Sketches of Statesmen*, vol. i. p. 297., ed. 1855) that this communication through Lord Eldon was an intrigue.

† Twiss, *ib.* p. 443.; Lord Malmesbury, p. 296-99.

‡ Lord St. Helens was the authority for this fact. Lord Malmesbury, *ib.* p. 304.; *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, *ib.* p. 286. It seems that the fact of the King having passed Mr. Pitt in the Park without notice in June, 1803, was commented on at the time. (*Memoirs of Horner*, vol. i. p. 221.)

united in the public service. Mr. Fox, on receiving the message, expressed no surprise, anger, or disappointment; said that he was himself too old\* to care about office† but that he had many friends who for years had followed him, and whom he should advise to join the Government, and he trusted that Pitt would give them places. Fox, anticipating the King's personal objection to him, had, on the day before Pitt's interview with the King, left a note with Mr. Grenville, announcing that he did not wish to stand in the way of any arrangement, and expressing a hope that his exclusion would not prevent either the Grenvilles or his own friends from accepting office. This disinterested conduct on his part weighed much with Lord Grenville and his friends in declining to acquiesce in his exclusion and to join Pitt.

On the receipt of the two answers Pitt testified much anger at the conduct of Lord Grenville, and much pleasure at that of Fox. He made an appointment to see Fox on the following morning, to which Fox assented; but Fox's friends, in the meantime, agreed not to accept office without him, and the interview never took place.†

Pitt was doubtless mortified at the decided refusal of the Grenville party, and disappointed at being compelled to form an administration without their assistance. The two principal parties were, for different reasons, closed against him; the Foxites, because their chief had been proscribed by the King; the Grenvilles, because Pitt had acquiesced in this proscription. The new administration, however, such as it was, was soon formed. Six of the existing Cabinet Ministers remained; viz., Lord Eldon, Lord Chancellor; Duke of Portland, President of the Council; Lord Westmoreland, Privy Seal; Lord Chatham,

---

\* Mr. Fox was at this time fifty-five years old.

† A full and confidential account of the views entertained by Pitt, prior to the overthrow of the Addington Ministry, and of the communications of his intentions which he made to Fox and Lord Grenville, is contained in a letter to Lord Melville, of March 29. 1804, privately printed by Lord Stanhope (then Lord Mahon) from the original at Melville Castle in 1852. In this letter Pitt declares his intention of informing the King that if he is resolved to exclude the friends both of Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville, he will be ready to do as he best can with his own friends, united with the most capable and unexceptionable persons of the existing Government, 'but of course excluding many of them, and above all, *Addington himself and Lord St. Vincent.*' He adds that Fox is prepared to support an anti-ministerial motion, 'under the full knowledge that if the result produces the removal of the Government, he (Pitt) holds himself at full liberty to form a new one without reference to him.'

Master of the Ordnance; and Lord Castlereagh, President of the Board of Control. Lord Hawkesbury was still Secretary of State, but was moved from the Foreign to the Home Department. The new Cabinet appointments were: Mr. Pitt, First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Harrowby, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Lord Camden, Secretary of State for War and Colonies; Lord Melville, First Lord of the Admiralty; Duke of Montrose, President of the Board of Trade; Lord Mulgrave, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. It will be observed that the only member of the House of Commons in this Cabinet, besides Mr. Pitt, was Lord Castlereagh. The result was that Pitt was driven, in substance, to the very arrangement which he had rejected when proposed to him by Addington a year before. Six of the old Cabinet remained; Pitt, with five new colleagues, was added. Of these five, Addington was willing to receive Lord Melville, and therefore, all that Pitt gained was the substitution of Lord Camden or Lord Mulgrave for Addington himself, and the addition of the Duke of Montrose, a change which profited nobody. It should, moreover, not be overlooked, that before a year was over, Pitt was glad to negotiate with Addington, and to admit him into his Cabinet.

The King consented reluctantly to this change of Government. He desired to retain Addington; he disliked the return of Pitt. In writing to Addington, after his resignation, he styles the late Minister 'his truly beloved friend, whose honour, truth, and personal attachment will ever be a source of the 'greatest pleasure and comfort His Majesty can enjoy.'\* The King likewise offered him an earldom, a pension for himself, and another for Mrs. Addington (which honour and emoluments were declined); and in his parting interview, expressed undiminished attachment and respect for the retiring Minister, and a strong disapproval of the means by which he had been supplanted.†

Addington, as we learn from his biographer, always considered his treatment by Pitt as unkind and unfair. Pitt, indeed, had not recommended him to office, but he had contributed more than any other man to his acceptance of it. He began by offering advice, and giving it; he then withdrew to a distance where he could not be consulted, and stood aloof from the

---

\* Life of Lord Sidmouth, *ib.* p. 292.

† *Ib.* p. 294. The King afterwards presented to Addington a copy of Beechey's portrait of himself on horseback, to be followed by portraits of himself and the Queen in their robes. This gift was accompanied by another flattering and affectionate letter. (*Ib.* p. 321.)

Government; and, finally, he threw his weight into the opposite scale, and, in fact, brought about Addington's downfall.\* It may be added that Canning's incessant artillery of newspaper attacks, both in verse and prose, against the whole Addington tribe, with all their medical apparatus, must have fostered a feeling of perpetual bitterness against Pitt, because Canning lived with him on terms of the utmost intimacy, and it could scarcely be doubted that his battery might have been silenced by a serious remonstrance coming from his honoured and beloved patron. Such was Addington's case against Pitt, but such was not the light in which the matter was viewed on the other side.

Dr. Addington had been the confidential physician of Lord Chatham. His son Henry and William Pitt were nearly of the same age†; they had been friends from childhood; and when Mr. Pitt had become Prime Minister, and Mr. Addington had

\* The following passage respecting Pitt's relations with Addington, occurs in Lord Grenville's intercepted letter to Lord Wellesley, dated July 12. 1803:—‘Though he did not recommend Addington to his present employment (and indeed who is there that knows him would have done it?) he nevertheless gave him a certain portion of influence, more active than my opinion would have permitted me to grant in the formation of the new administration. He advised their measures a long time after I had ceased to have any intercourse with them, and he approved of them in different points, which appeared to me the most criminal, and which were indeed so, as proved by the event. He is consequently more hampered in his conduct than I am, and he does not at present enjoy the inestimable advantage which I possess, of never having concealed nor compromised my opinion, in regard to matters of so much political importance; but I believe that his ideas on their political conduct are not much different from mine, if they differ at all, and to all this must be added a resentment justly merited from the personal conduct of Mr. Addington towards him. He does not endeavour to conceal his sentiments.’ (Ann. Reg. vol. xlv. p. 118.; Adolphus, vol. vii. p. 754.) In a letter to Lord Buckingham, of March 12. 1803, Lord Grenville says:—‘Pitt is still at Walmer. Messengers of all descriptions are going continually to him to bring him up. The prevailing opinion is, that he will come up next week, but I really can venture no conjecture. He has hampered himself to such a degree by his support of measures which he so totally disapproved, that I really hardly see what he has to do, and am glad the decision is not with me.’ (Court and Cabinets, vol. iii. p. 263.) Similar language occurs in a letter of Lord Grenville, of Oct. 20. 1802, *ib.* p. 212.

† Addington was Pitt's senior by two years; he was born in 1757, and Pitt in 1759.

obtained a seat in Parliament, intentions had been formed on several occasions of offering public employment to the latter. At length, upon the transfer of Mr. W. Grenville to the House of Lords, from the chair of the House of Commons, in 1789, the Speakership became vacant, and Addington was proposed and carried by the Government. He therefore owed his first elevation in great measure to the favour of Mr. Pitt\*: his unexpected and (we may add) undeserved elevation to the office of Prime Minister he owed to the favour of the King. Pitt encouraged his acceptance of this post, and for a time gave him countenance, support, and advice. Whether Pitt considered him a mere *locum tenens*, who was bound to withdraw whenever he might think fit to return, it is hard to say; but it could scarcely be expected that even Addington, certain as he was of the King's support, would consent to hold his office on such a tenure. The appointment of Mr. Tierney, as treasurer of the navy, in June, 1803, was regarded by the public as a measure personally offensive to Pitt, and could not fail to occur to himself in the same light. Pitt, however, though contentious in debate, and haughty in negotiation, was undoubtedly of a placable and forgiving spirit, and did not cherish personal resentments. A ministerial pamphlet, published in 1803, attacked Pitt with much asperity, and might be considered as disclosing those feelings and opinions which the Government dared not avow. It is, however, uncertain how far Addington can be justly held responsible for the contents of Mr. Bentley's anonymous pamphlet, and, on the whole, we have some difficulty in accounting for the 'just resentment' which Lord Grenville (no partial judge of Pitt's feelings at the time) says that Pitt entertained at Addington's personal conduct towards him. The

---

\* These obligations are alluded to in Canning's sarcastic poem of 'Elijah's Mantle,' written after Pitt's death.

'Sidmouth! though low that head is laid,  
Which called thee from thy native shade,  
And gave thee second birth;  
Gave thee the sweets of power and place,  
The tufted robe and gilded mace,  
And reared thy puny worth;

'Think how his mantle wrapt thee round.  
Is one of equal virtue found  
Among thy new competitors?  
Or can thy cloak of Amiens stuff,  
Once laughed to scorn by blue and buff,  
Hide thee from Windham's jeers?'

(Spirit of the Public Journals for 1806, vol. x. p. 153.)



part which Addington played was undoubtedly mean, low-minded, and selfish; he acted towards Pitt without generosity. He sought, by subservience towards him, and by thus obtaining the great leader's assistance, to retain his hold upon Parliament; and by subservience to the King, to retain the royal favour. In this manner he hoped, without any real merit or ability, to continue in office.

No man of spirit or independence would have played this shabby game. But on the other hand, the position which Pitt had made for himself was such as to deprive him of the right of severe criticism, to create dissatisfaction in the leaders of all parties, to expose him to blame from all sides, and to denude him of all cordial support except from his personal adherents. The part which he attempted to fill, of secret adviser of the measures of the Government, without real power or responsibility, was sure after a time to lead to disappointment and misunderstanding. His relations to Addington as a friend and counsellor in private, and an independent supporter or censor in public, were radically inconsistent. The middle line which he traced for himself, of tenderness and forbearance to Addington, and of abstinence from parliamentary pressure on the King, so much complained of by Lord Grenville\*, satisfied nobody; and was intelligible to nobody. It alienated the Grenvilles and Foxites, with whom he refused to form an alliance in opposition, and who therefore would not join him when he was charged with the formation of a Government; it wounded Addington, who considered himself overthrown by a friend; it failed in mitigating the King, who regarded Pitt as the real author of his favourite's ruin. It reduced public duty to a question of private feeling and personal delicacy. Whatever may be thought of Pitt's foreign and domestic policy during the War of the Revolution, it cannot be disputed that up to 1801 he showed all the qualities of a great parliamentary leader, and that he succeeded in inspiring confidence in a large body of followers. But by his ambiguous conduct during the three following years—by his policy of seclusion and mystery—he so far weakened his parliamentary position, that on being charged with the formation of a Ministry in 1804, he was unable to obtain the adhesion of any

---

\* Lord Grenville, in a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, written on the 7th of January, 1806, about a fortnight before Pitt's death, says that his hope of bringing about a Government formed of the ablest public men had been rendered desperate; 'Firstly, by the great misconduct of Pitt, who might have realised it, but refused to do so.' (*Court and Cabinets*, vol. iv. p. 9.) This must refer to the formation of Pitt's Government in 1804.

of the chief parliamentary parties. The Grenvilles, the Foxites, even Addington and his personal friends, stood aloof, and Pitt became in substance the head of the old Ministry, whose policy he had condemned in the most contemptuous language, and in whose overthrow he had taken the most prominent part. To such straits was Pitt by his own conduct reduced, who, powerful as he had been in Government, might, if he had acted a straightforward, resolute, and open part, have been still more powerful in Opposition, and, in combination with Lord Grenville and Fox, have dictated his own terms to the King and Addington. When Demosthenes was asked what was the first, and second, and third qualification of an orator, he answered, 'Delivery;' in like manner, if we were asked what is the first, and second, and third qualification of an English statesman, we would answer, 'Intelligibility.' As in oratory, the most eloquent words and the wisest counsels will avail but little if they are not impressed by voice and manner on the minds of an audience; so integrity and public spirit will fail to command confidence, if the course adopted is intricate and inexplicable.

The unfavourable light in which Pitt's conduct could be represented by an antagonist, without any clear or conclusive defence being possible, may be seen from the following retort to which he provoked Sheridan, by a taunt on his support of the Addington Government:—

'The right honourable gentleman (said Sheridan, in a debate on March 6th, 1805), has thought fit to allude to the support which I gave to Lord Sidmouth, when that noble lord was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He represents it as an insidious and hollow support. I hope it is not my character to give any support of that description. I say I gave my support to the late administration with the most perfect good faith, and I know that the noble lord has always been ready to acknowledge it. But supposing I had not supported him with firmness and fidelity—what then? I never had professed to do so, either to that administration or to this House. I supported them because I approved of many of their measures; but principally was I induced to support them because I considered their continuance in office a security against the return to power of the right honourable gentleman opposite me, which ever appeared to me as the greatest national calamity. If, indeed, I had recommended the noble lord to His Majesty; if I had come down to the House and described the noble lord as the fittest man in the country to fill the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, because it was a convenient step to my own safety, in retiring from a situation which I could no longer fill with honour; if, having seduced him into that situation, I had afterwards tapered off from a prominent support when I saw that the minister of my own choice was acquiring greater stability and popularity than I

wished for; if, when I saw an opening to my own return to power, I had entered into a combination with others, whom I meant also to betray, from the sole lust of power and office, in order to remove him; and if, under the dominion of these base appetites, I had then treated with ridicule and contempt the very man whom I had before held up to the choice of my Sovereign, and the approbation of this House and the public, then indeed I should have merited the contempt of all good men, and should have deserved to be told that I was hollow and insincere in my support, and had acted a mean and perfidious part.\*

Pitt took his seat after his re-election on the 18th of May. In proof of his efficiency as a war-minister, he soon afterwards introduced a Bill for improving the defences of the country, which was known as the Additional Force Bill. It met however with an unfavourable reception in the House of Commons; its second reading was opposed by 181 to 221 votes; it was much contested on other stages, and on one occasion Mr. Pitt went so far as to complain of the opposition made to it by the Grenville party. At the end of July Parliament was prorogued, and Pitt had now leisure to consider what steps he could take to strengthen himself before the beginning of another session.

This strength he sought in a quarter where it seemed least likely to be afforded, and whence it was most humiliating to him to accept it. Before the opening of the session, on the 15th of January, 1805 — a period at that time considered unusually late — a negotiation was opened with Addington for prevailing upon him to be reconciled with Pitt, and to accept a seat in the Cabinet. The ejected Minister, though recently unsparing in his censure of his successor †, was found placable; he was raised to the peerage as Lord Sidmouth, because, as was believed, Pitt feared his rival influence in the House of Commons; and he became President of the Council, instead of the Duke of Portland. The arrangement was highly pleasing

---

\* Sheridan had not spared Addington in the early part of his administration, as is shown by his joke about Theseus leaving his sitting part behind him, which Gilbert Wakefield furnished to him from a story in the *Scholia to Aristophanes*. (Eq. 1368.) It seems that the reporters did not catch the name, and that Nicias, instead of Theseus, appeared in the newspapers. (See Adolphus, vol. vii. p. 590.)

† 'Addington is more bitter than ever against the present Ministers.' (Mr. Grenville to the Marquis of Buckingham, Nov. 13. 1804. *Court and Cabinets*, vol. iii. p. 375.) \* The reconciliation between Pitt and Addington must have been sudden, as I know that only two days before, upon Pitt touching his hat as he passed by Addington, Addington observed to Dyson, who was riding with him, that even that greeting was new to him.' (The same, Jan. 7. 1805, *ib.* p. 404.)

to the King, but was not agreeable to the friends of either of the high contracting parties, and did not benefit Pitt either in popularity or character; at the same time Addington's friend, Lord Buckinghamshire, was made Chancellor of the Duchy, instead of Lord Mulgrave, who had taken Lord Harrowby's place.

The reconciliation was hollow, and its effects were not of long duration. The Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry had brought forward certain facts impugning the conduct of Lord Melville, with respect to his alleged misappropriation of public money, as Treasurer of the Navy. Upon this report, a motion inculpatory of him was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Whitbread. Pitt was eager to save his friend, and manifested the most lively anxiety during Wilberforce's speech, whose adverse opinion and vote produced much influence upon the House. Upon the division the numbers were equal, when the Speaker (Abbot) declared himself in favour of the motion of censure. Abbot was Addington's intimate friend; and Addington, differing from Pitt, took an unfavourable view of Lord Melville's case.\* A few days afterwards Mr. Pitt informed the House that Lord Melville had resigned the office of First Lord of the Admiralty, and subsequently that he had advised His Majesty to erase his name from the list of the Privy Council. In making the latter announcement, Pitt confessed that, however anxious he might be to accede to the wishes of the House, he felt a deep and bitter pang in being compelled to be the instrument of rendering the noble lord's punishment more severe.† The question then arose as to the appointment of Lord Melville's successor at the Admiralty. The arrangement which Lord Sidmouth desired was that his friend Lord Buckinghamshire should be First Lord

---

\* The strength of the feeling which prevailed at the time against Lord Melville, and the cry against Placemen and Scotsmen, is described by Mr. Horner in a letter to Sir James Mackintosh (*Life*, vol. i. p. 291.). Lord Malmesbury speaks of the huzzas and shouts of the House of Commons upon Lord Melville's condemnation, Sir Thomas Mostyn giving a view hollo, and 'we have killed the fox' (*Ib.* p. 338.). The question seems in both Houses to have been regarded rather as political than judicial. See Lord Campbell's remarks on his acquittal by the House of Lords, in the *Life of Lord Ellenborough*.

† After his acquittal by the House of Lords, Lord Melville was restored to his place in the Privy Council, but he never afterwards held office. According to Lord Holland, Pitt said to Mr. Huskisson at Bath, a short time before his death: 'We can get over Austerlitz, but we can never get over the Tenth Report. Such is the nature of Englishmen.' (*Mem. of Whig Party*, vol. ii. p. 48.)

of the Admiralty, and that his brother-in-law, Mr. Bragge Bathurst, should succeed to the vacant office of Chancellor of the Duchy. Mr. Pitt declined to accede to this proposal; but appointed Sir C. Middleton, an experienced naval officer (now created Lord Barham) to the Admiralty. Hereupon Lord Sidmouth resigned; but upon the request of Mr. Pitt, and after full explanations and assurances, which he deemed satisfactory, he withdrew his resignation, and consented to remain.\* Matters were thus patched up in April, but the further proceedings in Lord Melville's case brought on fresh disagreements, and finally dissolved the ill-cemented alliance. In a division on the question of Lord Melville's impeachment, near the end of June, some of Addington's followers, to whom Pitt had promised office, voted against the Government. Pitt said that their conduct must be *marked*, which language Addington regarded as a personal indignity, and a breach of the previous understanding, that his friends should be at liberty to act as they thought fit on Lord Melville's case. He therefore tendered his resignation; and this time Pitt expressed no wish that it might be recalled. Such was Addington's version of this transaction †; Pitt's was somewhat different; namely, that he was prepared to fulfil his promise in a short time, but not at that moment, when the votes had been so recently given. ‡ Be this as it may, Addington, and his friend Lord Buckinghamshire, now ceased to be members of the Cabinet; their places were filled by Lord Camden and Lord Harrowby, Lord Camden being succeeded by Lord Castlereagh in the Department of War and Colonies. On the 12th of July the session was brought to a close, without any further ministerial change.

Although Pitt's Government survived the session, its weakness was apparent, and indeed admitted.§ His political isola-

\* Life of Lord Sidmouth, *ib.* p. 356–364. 368.; *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iv. p. 78.

† Life of Lord Sidmouth, *ib.* p. 367–75.

‡ Lord Malmesbury, *ib.* p. 338. According to Lord Malmesbury's account, Addington offended the King at his audience by awkwardly offering His Majesty the key of the cabinet boxes, and by forcing him to listen to an unseasonable explanation, which lasted an hour.

§ 'Pitt will certainly not go out yet, and I am not one of those who think it impossible that he should last some time longer.' (Mr. Fox to Lord Holland, April 9. 1805. *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iv. p. 77.) 'Pitt, though he may still have a bare majority, is too weak to carry on the Government as it is; at least we flatter ourselves so.' (To Mr. O'Brien, July 7. 1805, *ib.* p. 88.) 'What is clearest of all is, that Pitt is very low, and does not seem to have any notion of what plan he can follow to raise himself.' (To Lord Lauderdale, July 12. 1815,

tion, now increased by the humiliating reconciliation with Addington, and its speedy rupture, could not but fill his mind with anxiety, as the successes of Napoleon and the difficulties of the country multiplied. Being deprived even of Addington, he sought to obtain the King's permission to revive the negotiation with Fox and Lord Grenville. He appears to have made his first attempt in July, on the resignation of Addington, and to have met with a refusal.\* The arrangement just described was the consequence. Foiled in this endeavour, he meditated a second attempt upon the King at Weymouth; and a letter announcing this intention was written by Lord Camden, the new Lord President, to Lord Grenville.† Pitt followed the King to Weymouth in the month of September; again he sought, in a long interview, to overcome the King's objections to Mr. Fox, and again he failed.‡ The negotiation, desired by Mr. Pitt, and expected by Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville, never therefore

---

ib. p. 99.) 'I see no newspapers that speak of politics; but I think the tone of the paragraphs ought to be to treat with contempt the notion of Pitt's being able to carry on the Government as he is, or to gain any accession of strength; and Castlereagh's appointment [to the Department of War and Colonies] ought to be stated as complete proof of his weakness and impotence in either view.' (To Mr. O'Brien, July 17. 1805, ib. p. 102.) 'I hear that to those who casually see him [Pitt], his appearance is just as it was in the House of Commons, that of extreme uneasiness, and almost misery. Most of his friends speak of the extreme desirableness of a junction, and some even of the absolute necessity of it.' (To Mr. Grey, Aug. 28. 1805, ib. p. 105.)

\* See Mr. Adair to Mr. Fox, July 7. 1805, ib. vol. iv. p. 90.; and Mr. Fox to Mr. Grey, July 9., ib. p. 95. Lord Grenville to Marquis of Buckingham, June 25. and July 6. Court and Cabinets, ib. p. 426, 427. There must be a misprint in the date of one of these letters: either Lord Grenville's letter should be July 8., or Mr. Fox's July 7.

† Dated July 10. Court and Cabinets, ib. p. 430. Pitt in his letter to Lord Melville, of March, 1804 (already quoted), speaks of the advantages which the King would derive, in an equal degree with the country, from the extinction of parties, and the establishment of a Government uniting all the weight and talents of the day, and capable of commanding respect and confidence both at home and abroad.

‡ For the positive evidence of this fact, we are indebted to a memorandum of information from a gentleman then attached to the Court, who was at Weymouth when Mr. Pitt came, and who received an account of the interview first from Mr. Pitt, and afterwards from the King himself. The interview lasted three hours, and Mr. Pitt desisted from further pressure, lest he should disturb the King's mind.

took place, and Pitt resigned himself to the idea of meeting Parliament without any accession of administrative or parliamentary strength.\*

It is, in our opinion, certain that a junction with Fox and Lord Grenville was at this moment sincerely, nay ardently, desired by Pitt, and that his disappointment at the King's refusal to admit Fox into the Cabinet, by which alone Lord Grenville's adhesion could be obtained, was great and genuine. His conduct, and the exigencies of his position, equally point to this conclusion. If Pitt seriously meditated such a junction of parties, it cannot be doubted that he had maturely considered the means by which it was to be effected, and that he was prepared with such an offer as it would be reasonable to make and honourable to accept. At the same time, it is difficult to perceive how this Coalition Government could have been arranged so as to satisfy the pretensions of the rival leaders. Mr. Pitt, in his letter to Lord Melville, of March 29. 1804, — written a short time before the fall of Addington's Ministry — said, 'I do not see how, under any circumstances, I can creditably or usefully consent to take part in any Government without being at the head of it; and I should be very sorry that either Lord Moira, or, through him, the Prince, should suppose that there is any chance of my changing my opinion on this point.'† On the other hand, Fox, in his letters written at the time when the offer was believed to be impending, declares that he will not belong to any Cabinet of which Pitt is the head, and that the existing Cabinet must be considered as annihilated, and the formation of a new Ministry conceded, before he will negotiate; even if Pitt is willing to concede these terms, he is desirous rather of finding obstacles to an agreement than of smoothing the way to a compromise.

The attempts of Pitt during this year to organise and support a European confederacy against Bonaparte, had resulted in the capitulation of Ulm on October the 17th, and the battle

---

\* Fox's belief seems to have been that the King had consented to a negotiation with himself and Lord Grenville, that Pitt went down to Weymouth to arrange with the King the terms of the offer, and that Pitt's subsequent silence was owing to his own reluctance to negotiate. See *Court and Cabinets*, ib. p. 432. 438. *Mem. of Fox*, vol. iv. p. 109. 111. 115. Lord Grenville became aware, early in October, that, as the result of Pitt's visit, there would be no offer. (*Court and Cabinets*, ib. p. 439. 443, 444.) In the letter of Oct. 22. he says: — 'Now that all hope of united government must finally be relinquished.' See also Mr. Grenville's letter, ib. p. 441.

† Lord Mahon's *Secret Correspondence*, p. 12.

of Austerlitz on December the 2nd. The battle of Trafalgar had, indeed, intervened, and had in some measure counteracted the land victories by extinguishing\* the French maritime power. The military prospects of the country were however gloomy, and could not fail to depress even the sanguine mind of Pitt, who, with a feebly organised Government, and with impaired bodily powers, was preparing to meet Parliament. That event however was destined never to occur. Pitt's health appears to have been in a failing state for some time past, though his age—he was now in his forty-eighth year—forbad the idea that his malady threatened his life. He went to Bath early in December, and returned to his house on Putney Heath about the 10th of January, 1806. Even on the road his condition was so emaciated that Sir Walter Farquhar, his physician, pronounced complete rest and abstinence from business to be necessary to his recovery, and considered his life in danger. Upon his arrival at Putney, his symptoms of debility were aggravated, and are stated to have assumed the character of typhus fever. On the 23rd of the month he died. Even at the last the fatal termination of his malady had been so little anticipated that his usual official dinner at the meeting of Parliament took place on the 20th, at his house in Downing Street. This premature death of a man who had since 1782 occupied so prominent a position in the eyes of England, and of all Europe, and who now filled the office of Prime Minister, could not fail to make a deep impression on the public mind. At a meeting of Opposition leaders which was held when he was at the point of death, it was agreed to suspend for the moment all political hostilities. The generous mind of Fox was touched with feelings of sadness, not of joy, at the approaching end of his great rival; he could not endure the idea of going down to debate in the House of Commons when Pitt was in extremities. ‘*Mentem mortalia tangunt,*’ he said.\*

An undue importance is often attached to the incoherent ramblings of eminent men upon their death-beds. It seems certain that Pitt died with little warning of his danger, and that his mind was in a lethargic state, with occasional delirium, for some time before his death. The story of his patriotic exclamation, which has been denied, is however, in a certain sense, well attested. Lord Malmesbury states that Lady Malmesbury saw Pitt's physician, Sir Walter Farquhar, three days after his death, and received from him an account of his last hours; and that almost the last words he spoke intelligibly were these, to

---

\* Life of Horner, vol. i. p. 328.



himself, and more than once repeated,—‘Oh, what times! oh, my country!’\*

The latter part of Pitt’s life had been clouded by disappointments and mortifications. The King’s objection to Fox, and the consequent refusal of the chief politicians to join his Ministry; his compulsory recourse to Addington’s assistance, and the speedy defection of his ignominious ally; his failure in saving Lord Melville from forced resignation and impeachment†; and the defeat of his continental policy by the surrender of Ulm and the battle of Austerlitz‡; must have come as successive blows to his spirit. This period was one of unusual care, anxiety, and depression; but his mind unquestionably possessed sufficient

\* Diary, *ib.* p. 346. Wilberforce says, in a letter written at the time:—‘He spoke very little for some days before he died, and was ‘extremely weakened and reduced on the Wednesday morning, when ‘he was first talked to as a dying man. He expired early on Thursday ‘morning.’ (*Life*, vol. iii. p. 252.)

† Lord Fitzharris, Lord Malmesbury’s eldest son, who was a Lord of the Treasury at the time, gives the following account of Pitt’s feelings with respect to the vote against Lord Melville:—‘I have ever ‘thought that an aiding cause of Pitt’s death, certainly one that tended ‘to shorten his existence, was the result of the proceedings against his ‘old friend and colleague, Lord Melville. I sat wedged close to Pitt ‘himself the night when we were 216 to 216, and the Speaker, Abbot ‘(after looking as white as a sheet, and pausing for ten minutes), gave ‘the casting vote against us. Pitt immediately put on the little cocked ‘hat that he was in the habit of wearing when dressed for the evening, ‘and jammed it deeply over his forehead, and I distinctly saw the tears ‘trickling down his cheeks.’ (*Lord Malmesbury*, *ib.* p. 347.)

‡ A song written by Walter Scott for the anniversary meeting of the Pitt Club of Scotland, in 1814, commences with the following stanza:—

‘O dread was the time and more dreadful the omen,  
When the brave on Marengo lay slaughtered in vain,  
And beholding broad Europe bowed down by her foemen,  
Pitt closed in his anguish the map of her reign.  
Not the fate of broad Europe could bend his brave spirit  
To take for his country the safety of shame;  
O then in her triumph remember his merit,  
And hallow the goblet that flows to his name.’

Marengo was the first step in Bonaparte’s career of independent aggression, and in June, 1800, the date of the battle of Marengo, broad Europe was not bowed down by her foemen. Moreover, the Peace of Amiens, in which Pitt heartily concurred, was made in the following year; and this peace was generally considered (if Sheridan’s dictum was true) to involve ‘the safety of shame.’ The allusion seems more appropriate to Austerlitz than to Marengo.

strength to bear the weight, if his body had not been undermined by physical causes.

Shortly after Mr. Pitt's death, a motion was made in the House of Commons for a grant of 40,000*l.* to pay his debts. The motion was carried without opposition, and the money was afterwards paid to his executors, Lord Chatham and the Bishop of Lincoln. Mr. Wilberforce tried to induce Pitt's private friends to contribute this sum, liberally offering to bear his share, but he failed in the attempt. Mr. Pitt's friends had raised 12,000*l.* in the autumn of 1801; shortly after his resignation, in order to relieve him from embarrassment; and one of the subscribers to this sum wished it to be included in the grant; but to this proposal Mr. Wilberforce strongly objected, and it was in consequence abandoned.\* From 1784 to 1801, Mr. Pitt had held the offices of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, the joint salary of which was then about 7500*l.* a year, together with an official residence in Downing Street. Besides this, he had, since 1792, held the sinecure office of Warden of the Cinque Ports, with a salary of 3000*l.* a year, to which the use of Walmer Castle was attached. Wilberforce says, that he lived at the rate of 5000*l.* or 6000*l.* a year. The celebrated inscription under Pitt's monument in Guildhall, by Mr. Canning, records in his honour, that 'Dispensing for near 'twenty years the favours of the Crown, he lived without ostentation, and he died poor.' But if, being unmarried and having no expensive tastes or pursuits, he was at the same time in the receipt of an ample income, it would have been rather natural that he should have died rich, than that he should have died poor. We can only explain the contrary result on the supposition that, being entirely indifferent about money, and engrossed with public affairs, he neglected to attend to his own expenditure, and was plundered by his domestics.

At the time of Pitt's death there was a general disposition among the leaders of all political parties, on account of the critical state of our relations with the Continent, to sink minor differences in a general union, and to form a Coalition Government resting on a wide and comprehensive basis. This idea, promulgated and enforced by Lord Grenville, was adopted by Pitt, and would have been carried into effect by him in 1804, if his attempt had not been frustrated by the King's refusal to admit Fox into the Cabinet. The result of this failure was, that even Pitt was only able to form a weak and struggling administration; and if he had lived, the King would doubtless

---

\* *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 244-54.

have been compelled by Parliamentary pressure to allow his minister to seek strength in the quarters where alone it could be obtained. We propose, in another article, to trace the consequences of this state of parties, and to show how the project of a Coalition Government, including the ablest men of different political connexions, was realised by Mr. Pitt's survivors.

---

ART. VI. — *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. By AN OLD BOY.  
4th edition. Cambridge: 1857.

NO two books can well be less like each other than 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' and the later volumes of 'Dr. Newman's Sermons,' but they have one characteristic point of resemblance. Each is a prolonged dramatic *aside*. Dr. Newman addresses Roman Catholics that Protestants may overhear him, and the 'Old Boy' speaks to his contemporaries through the medium of his juniors. Like 'old-fashioned sermons, the book is addressed to two descriptions of persons: boys and men. The part of the book which is addressed to boys is very simple, and we think so good that hardly any praise can be too high for it. The author has succeeded in an attempt in which Miss Edgeworth failed. The weak point of such stories as 'Barring out,' 'Eton Montem,' 'Frank,' and others in which schoolboys and their doings are put upon the scene, is that they were written by a woman who could only guess at the real character of that most curious phase of society, life at a public school. 'Tom Brown,' on the contrary, is the exact picture of the bright side of a Rugby boy's experiences told with a life, a spirit, and a fond minuteness of detail and recollection which is infinitely honourable to the author. Many men have received equally strong impressions from their passage through a public school, but few would, we think, be able to paint them with so much vigour and fidelity. It requires so much courage, so much honesty, so much purity, to traverse that stage of life without doing and suffering many things which make the recollection of it painful, that a man who can honestly describe his school experience in the tone which the author of 'Tom Brown' maintains throughout this volume without an effort, has a very high claim indeed to the respect and gratitude of his readers. It would be hard to imagine a more cheerful or a more useful lesson to a public school boy. Every corner of the playground, every rule of football, every quaint school usage, almost every room in the schoolhouse, is sketched so boldly and yet

so accurately that Rugbyans will, no doubt, be able to realise to themselves every sentence of the book. Even the gentiles of Eton, Harrow, or Winchester, bigoted, as they are sure to be, in favour of their own institutions, cannot fail to see that Tom Brown was a very fine fellow, and that, though he had the misfortune to be at Rugby, they can hardly do better than follow his example in several particulars.

The story itself is so slight that it hardly admits of criticism. It is nothing more than a series of pictures of various parts of boy life. First of all we have the infancy of Tom Brown amongst what were, though under the influence of free trade and scientific agriculture they have almost ceased to be, the Berkshire downs. The charms of open air, springy turf, and rural feasts, glorified by exhibitions of wrestling and backsword; the wisdom of hedge doctors, and the delights of rambling about with village companions after birds' nests or bulrushes, are set forth very picturesquely, but we must say rather tyrannically. It is not every one who has had the good fortune to be born in a country village with its quaint customs and primitive simplicity. The aristocratic contempt which the 'Old Boy' expresses for such of his juniors as 'go gadding over half Europe every holidays' is rather hard upon those who, if they took his advice to find their pleasures at home, would have no amusement more exciting than a visit to Astley's, and no sport more wholesome than fishing in the Serpentine. After a short episode at a private school, which finds little favour in the eyes of his biographer, Tom Brown is transported to Rugby by the orthodox stage coach, the fine old English gentleman of the road. At Rugby a certain Harry East, the fidus Achates of the hero, takes him in hand at once, and introduces him to a football match, which is described in the style of a Homeric battle, and with a certain combination of zest and solemnity which almost makes us suspect that the game was only played last week, and that in some mysterious manner the 'Old Boy's' whole prospects in life depended on its issue. Its incidents and management are curiously characteristic of the whole system of English public school life. The game is anything but a mere amusement. Indeed, the name can only be applied to so solemn an institution by a classical metaphor. It is an *ἀγών*, something between a battle and a sacrifice. 'Every boy in the school must be there.' 'Some of the sixth stop at the door to turn the whole string of boys into the close. The rest go forwards to see that no one escapes by any of the sidegates.' The two armies are regularly marshalled: there are the goal keepers and their captain; the quarters and their

captain; and the players up in their various divisions, each led by its own captain; and last of all comes the great Panjandrum himself, Old Brooke, who is to kick off. How that mighty king of men, and Menelaus his brother, good at need, and Crab Jones, the many counselled, and the swiftfooted East, and the newly arrived Tom Brown, and other stalwart souls of heroes demeaned themselves on the occasion, the 'Old Boy' relates in a manner half Greek and half Gothic; for if the contest itself is Homeric, the songs and the beer by which it is celebrated in the evening, and the eloquence with which 'Pater Brooke' exhorts his survivors on the prospect of his own removal from amongst them, are redolent rather of the Walhalla than of the Pantheon.

In the midst of all this glory, valour, and rejoicing, the tidings of our might, the festal city's blaze, and the wine cup crowned in light, some tenderly disposed readers may be inclined to turn a pitying eye on the unfortunates who were forced into playing against their will; and, certainly, though young gentlemen with a proper allowance of muscle and due toughness of lungs may find it both pleasant and profitable to kick and be kicked for the glory of their respective sides, the unlucky boys, 'obliged to stay in goal' and arranged 'so as to 'occupy the whole space between the goal posts at distances of 'about five yards apart,' would appear to claim some pity. To stand sentry over nothing for a couple of hours, keeping yourself warm by blowing your fingers and stamping your feet, and looking on while others play, is certainly not the liveliest amusement in the world. Such hardships are, however, an essential part of the system. It is the distinctive peculiarity of most of our public schools that the boys voluntarily force each other and themselves to acquire a certain physical training which to a vast proportion of them is the most important branch of their school education. The whole genius of the system is quite opposed to so low a view of the great mysteries of football, cricket, and boating, as that which regards them as mere amusements; they are exercises and tasks, the performance of which is enforced by far stronger sanctions than any which the authorities of the school have it in their power to apply. Even when, as at Eton, no direct force is employed to compel the boys to play at the games of the season, there is an indirect compulsion at least as inexorable. A boy may not be actually obliged to play on any particular occasion; but if he habitually abstains from doing so he becomes a social outcast, and exposes himself to a very strong suspicion of being guilty of the one unpardonable sin—punishable by unlimited thrashing, contempt,

and excommunication — namely, cowardice. Upon any other view of the character of these games the continuance of some of them would be quite inexplicable. It is, for example, as difficult to suppose that any one should voluntarily choose to amuse himself by what at Eton used to be called ‘playing at ‘the wall’ as to imagine that in the absence of any custom to that effect Hindoo widows should have treated themselves to the luxury of a Suttee.

To return to the experiences of Tom Brown. After being tossed in a blanket, scouring the country at Hare and Hounds, and getting used to the ways of the school, he falls upon evil days. The big sixth form boys who used to keep order leave the scene of their glories, and a brutal tyranny on the part of the fifth form, who illegally usurp the right of fagging, sets in. The war between East and Brown on the one hand, and the bully Flashman on the other, is carried on with great spirit and truth; and we own to feeling more gratification at the triumph of the two little boys who are incited by a very queer good angel called Digges to combine to thrash the big bully, than we have felt for years past at the prosperous union of any hero and heroine whatever. Poor Tom, however, suffers to a certain extent from his insubordination; for having quelled his tyrant the bully, he proceeds, by a not unnatural association of ideas, to make war upon school regulations. He gets flogged for trespassing, reported for scrambling on to the roof of the tower and scratching his name on the minute hand of the clock, flogged for going to Rugby fair, and otherwise subjected to the penalties made and provided for various treasons, felonies, and misdemeanors. At this point in his career, Dr. Arnold's discipline is brought on the stage. A quiet, timid, clever boy, with a delicate body and strong principles, is, at the doctor's suggestion, allotted to the hero for a chum. Brown protects him, honours him, throws a boot at the head of another boy who laughs at him for saying his prayers, takes shame to himself for having failed to do so according to an old promise made to his mother, and thenceforth adopts the practice. Arthur, the delicate boy, entirely reclaims Tom, who in return weans him by degrees from his physical timidity, and initiates him into the athletics of the place.

The rest of the book is occupied principally with grave subjects, to which we shall refer directly; but they are relieved by two other passages from the common life of schoolboys. The first is a fight between Tom Brown and ‘Slogger Williams,’ and the second a grand cricket-match between Rugby and Marylebone, played on the eve of the hero's departure in the full blaze of his glory as præpostor and captain of the eleven. Each of

these episodes is excellently described. The account of the fight, though luxuriant in its details, is free from any approach to coarseness or brutality, and the description of the cricket-match puts the scene before the reader's eyes with extraordinary distinctness, and shows an appreciation of the delicacies of the game which excites both respect and envy.

The book ends with Dr. Arnold's death and the deep grief with which Brown, then an Oxford man on a fishing tour in Skye, receives the news, and hurries off to Rugby to mourn over his old master. It is long since we have read anything more touching and at the same time more manly. The union of several sad and solemn currents of thought: sorrow for the loss of a guide so deeply honoured and loved; anxiety and something like awe at the change from boyhood to manhood; the fond melancholy with which those who have deserved it are privileged to look back from its close upon the incidents of the first chapter of life; are all described with a manly simplicity, a quiet piety, and an occasional touch of hearty unobtrusive humour which make it impossible to close the book without a feeling of personal gratitude to the author. Whatever exception may be taken to some of its features and to some of the characteristics of the school which it eulogizes, it is impossible not to feel that there must be very great merits in a system which could inspire such an affection. No slight praise is due to a school which is remembered so freshly and described so affectionately after the lapse of twenty years. If any method of education can confer upon or encourage in its pupils the simplicity, the light-heartedness, the honesty, purity, and courage which are manifested in every page of '*Tom Brown's Schooldays*,' it has solved a far more important and more difficult problem than is involved in the production of any amount of classical or mathematical knowledge.

Passing from the story which is addressed to boys to the moral addressed to men, our praise of '*Tom Brown's Schooldays*' must be far more qualified. When the vigorous freshness of the descriptions, and the warmhearted generosity of the moral tone are subtracted from the book, the residuum will be found to consist of three elements. The author profoundly admires the general character and constitution of English public schools. He almost worships Dr. Arnold; and he views every part of the subject through the medium of the doctrines of a school of which Mr. Kingsley is at once the ablest and the most popular teacher. We have something to say upon each of these subjects; and we cannot entirely agree with the author in the view which he takes of any one of them. In many of his views about the

general character of public schools it is impossible not to concur most cordially. There can be no doubt that some of the most important elements of the moral training common to them all are most sound and important. They are, beyond all question, the strongest modern illustration of the old Persian theory that the best education for youth consisted in riding, drawing the bow, and speaking the truth; nor are we at all disposed to quarrel with the opinion, that, designedly or not, they have adopted the best means of enforcing discipline, by leaving it to the boys themselves. The advantages of this arrangement could hardly be obtained in any other manner. They consist not only in the physical qualities they develope; nor in the production of that special form of courage (once most absurdly depreciated as a merely animal quality) which consists in readiness to brave obvious and immediate danger, and to which this country owes a very large proportion of its greatness; but in a knowledge of the world and of human nature, altogether invaluable to society at large, and singularly conducive to the complete formation of the manly character.

Any one who will take the trouble to analyse the various forms of extravagant opinion which have produced so much mischief within the last half century, will find that almost all of them are closely connected with, if they did not actually originate in, diseased sensibility, and the want of a due estimate of the comparative force and importance of human passions and pursuits. The rebels against society, from Byron and Shelley downwards; the dreamers who have been kicking against the pricks for the last forty years in all parts of the world; the pale-eyed prophets muttering fearful change in religion, politics, literature, art, and all other departments of human knowledge; have in almost every instance broken out of the course, either because they were haunted by some vision of perfection which, as they supposed, would become a reality but for the prejudices and stupidity of mankind, or because they felt unexplained wants, unrecognised longings, and unacknowledged powers, which only required discovery to make their possessors the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time. That such feelings have had less influence, and that such revolts have produced less effect, in this than in most other countries, is often imputed to us as a fault by continental critics. We are taunted with being a race whose old men dream no dreams, and whose youth see no visions. Englishmen in general will willingly plead guilty to such an accusation; and amongst the causes which produce the facts on which it is founded, they may, we think, fairly rate very highly the moral influence of our public school education. We do not



believe that any system was ever invented so real, so healthy, and so bracing both to the mind and body. It dispels illusions, calms the imagination, and sobers the whole moral and intellectual constitution as effectually as it hardens the muscles and braces the nerves. The way in which this is brought about is in a great majority of cases obvious enough. Boys too young to have vitiated their minds with speculations about life are suddenly thrown into the midst of a miniature of the real world in which they are to live, reproducing very vigorously and exactly, and without any artificial disguise, the motives and the conduct, the good and the evil, of the larger world outside. The entire absence of any restraint or supervision, except during the few hours actually passed at lessons, is the best possible security against their forming illusions about the life which lies beyond their own observation. Bound a boy's horizon by the walls of his school or his playground, protect him against his comrades, against his own idleness, supineness, and extravagance, by vigilant supervision and a routine discipline, turn his physical education into a task, and his imagination is sure to run riot upon everything from which he is debarred. He will invest the fields and the streets which he may not visit, and the passions which he is artificially prevented from indulging, with a sort of fairyland colouring; and when he is actually admitted to them — during the effervescence of mind and feeling which so often marks the transition from boyhood to manhood — he will be sure in every direction to see men as trees walking. It is hardly possible that an English public school boy should fall into this kind of mistake; for he has been brought into contact from a very early age, almost from childhood, with real men, real passions, and real things, situated nearly as they are elsewhere, and acting upon each other naturally, without the intervention of any disturbing forces; and when he hears or speaks of them, his associations are with realities, and not with mere words in books.

Such is the effect produced by this system upon those average minds which form an immense numerical majority in every large school; but it must not be forgotten that public schools, like other communities of boys or men, contain a small minority of persons distinguished by those peculiarities of temperament, mental and bodily, which may be symptomatic of a certain febrile irritability of character, but which, it must be confessed, are sometimes the companions of the very highest endowments, moral and intellectual. Amongst these will be found, in all probability, most of the members of that very small class which it is not desirable to absorb into the common

business of life. It is, indeed, hardly possible to scrutinise too strictly the pretensions of any one who proposes to pursue an exceptional course. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the ambition to be a man of genius, and to decline what so many idle and vapouring minds consider the vulgar pursuits of trading, professional or social life, is a silly and not a very harmless fancy; but in the hundredth case the refusal to admit the claim is nothing less than a public calamity; for if it does not neutralise powers of incalculable importance to the happiness of mankind, it is only too likely to goad them into rebellion against the whole social fabric. It was a misfortune that the industry and ingenuity of Fearn should be wasted upon such a barbarous Chinese puzzle as Contingent Remainders; but it was a grievous and fearful thing that Mirabeau should be driven into exile and debauchery because France could not find employment for one of the few men who might have stood between the living and the dead in the great revolution.

It would be hard to mention any weightier responsibility than that which is involved in the education of a peculiar boy. To treat the symptoms of what differs but little from disease as being symptoms of genius, is almost certain to produce an overweening vanity, fatal to the boy's future capacity for any of the careers of life; whilst, on the other hand, there are few more melancholy histories than those which record the tortures inflicted on youths whose genius was mistaken for disease. A mistake in the one direction may convert a lazy dreamy lad into an emasculate coxcomb. A mistake in the other may lash a Cowper or Shelley into melancholy madness. These are the exceptional cases, for which no general rule can be laid down. All that can be done is to recognise the fact, that sensibility often greatly needs vigorous correctives. What correctives are likely in any case to be vigorous is matter of experiment; but where there is sufficient constitutional vigour in the subject, public school life is often an admirable prescription.

It may, no doubt, happen that such a boy may be considerably persecuted, but even if he is, there may be cases in which the discipline would be good for him. To the great majority of such boys, however, persecution would be only an occasional and transient inconvenience, and the other influences of a public school are perhaps even more wholesome for an imaginative sensitive lad, than for his commonplace companions. To those who know how to use it, a public school is a sort of grammar and dictionary of human nature, and in the study of human nature a good elementary grounding is even more important than in that of language or of mathematics. A most

striking illustration of this may be seen in the writings of the most observant of living novelists. Nothing can show more emphatically how much Mr. Thackeray owes to his Charterhouse experience, than the prominence which he gives to school life in no less than three of his novels, and the clearness with which he enables us to recognise in the boy the features of the man.

Independently of the knowledge which it gives him of his schoolfellows, a public school affords to such a boy as we are describing an excellent opportunity of learning his own place in life. He will find that talents and accomplishments do not govern the world, and that in order to understand the working of society, it is necessary to be something more than an accomplished gentleman. He will learn to estimate the power, whatever he may think of the merits, of a hard coarse temperament, and he will discover the immunities which a light heart and a thick skin confer on their possessors. He will learn how to go through life without undertaking what he is not fit for, without repining at what cannot be helped. Mr. Thackeray has, we think, painted these results of public school life, very happily in the characters of Pendennis and Clive Newcome. The one is timid and sceptical, the other bold and generous, but each knows the length of his tether perfectly well, and each learns it at school, though Pendennis forgets his lesson at college, and has to learn it a second time in London. We owe it to our public schools, Mr. Thackeray tells us, that young Englishmen are more modest than their neighbours. We may perhaps vary, and at the same time illustrate this expression, by saying that they are better broken in. They see the world in more sober colours, and have a clearer view of the nature of the pursuits of life, and of the conditions under which they are possible. It is impossible to overrate the importance of acquiring such habits of mind; for no one can look at life without perceiving that nothing can be easier than to take a sceptical do-nothing view of it. The great mystery of the nature and origin of evil transforms itself into countless shapes, and makes it possible, for any one who is inclined to do so, to ridicule or to defy every law and institution of social life; for it cannot be denied that a man who directs his attention only to one side of human affairs, may always find a justification for despising what is most useful, and ridiculing what is most sacred. There are still some writers who will speak of government as corrupt and organised oppression; of marriage as a sham, substituted by avarice and worldliness for love; and of all organised systems of religion as spiritual prisonhouses; and it is a

melancholy truth, that wickedness and folly constantly supply evidence in support of such assertions. Their real refutation lies in an appeal to experience. The slightest acquaintance with any one sphere of active life overthrows them at once, and satisfies any moderately candid mind that, whatever may be the confusions and contradictions of human affairs, they are regulated, in some way or other, by laws and principles which no one can afford to neglect, or even to misapprehend. The same experience will, in most cases, go further, and convince those who obtain it that, speaking very broadly, society is right and not wrong on these subjects, and that practices or theories which can only be justified on the opposite supposition are *ipso facto* refuted. Practical scepticism has never existed to any considerable extent except amongst people who were isolated from their kind by ease, or maddened by wrong and suffering. A careless *Bohémien* who stands alone in life, who has no family, no particular calling, good health and lively talents, may mock at the world and its ways, or, if he is sulky, may turn socialist and curse it; and the same disposition will be found to prevail more or less in other classes of society in exact proportion to the degree in which their members stand aloof from the real business of life. If, however, a man has to keep a shop, to follow a profession, to manage an estate, to bring up a family, or to carry on the business of the world in any other department, he finds at once that he must either mismanage and abandon it altogether, or take up with the ordinary principles, vulgar as they may look, and absurd and worn out as he may have thought them.

Such conclusions are embraced by some men only as the result of painful experience of the folly of denying them. Others will admit them doggedly and cynically, to the exclusion of all softer feelings, except the regret with which they look back upon a careless youth and its brilliant illusions. It is the great glory of our English schools that they teach so many of their pupils a more excellent way,—that they lead them to acknowledge the laws and submit to the evils of life, not with pain and grief, but with a hearty assent, which invigorates human nature. No greater service can be rendered to any one than that of launching him upon life with a willing and rational consent to the principles which govern it, neither wrung from him by penitence, nor imposed upon him, as a bit is forced into the mouth of a vicious horse, by fear and pain. In a great proportion of cases our public schools effect this for their pupils by introducing them, from a very early age indeed, to a genuine though a somewhat rough phase of life, and by furnishing them with a standard by which they may afterwards judge to some

extent of the value of the schemes and theories upon the subject which they will meet with.

It may perhaps be objected to such a system that it has a tendency to make boys prematurely hard and worldly; and there can be no doubt that when the system fails, as of course it often must, it fails in this direction. On the other hand, it occasionally subjects the mind to a sterner discipline than it can bear, and, as in the case of Shelley, produces in an aggravated form the very evils which in most instances it cures. These, however, are the exceptions. As a general rule there are few things to which an Englishman looks back with more affection than his school and his college. In most of our great schools there is much that is not only venerable and picturesque, but thoroughly kindly. The mere official teaching by no means exhausts the relation between the masters and the boys. Their out-door pursuits are not only permitted, but without being made a task, except by themselves, are fully recognised and anxiously encouraged. Even in the matter of study, the elder boys receive a great deal of individual assistance and advice from the masters, and gradually come to be treated by them with much personal confidence. All these, and many other circumstances, produce a tie between the pupil and the school, which often strengthens as life advances; and, sometimes, as in the case of the Marquis of Wellesley, is cherished and displayed in its most solemn acts. No stronger evidence could be given of the hold which a great public school exercises over the affections of the highest minds, than the fact that the man who added Southern and Central India to the British Empire, desired that his body might be laid in the chapel of Eton College; and this sentiment has never been more finely expressed than in the lines which were one of the last productions of that august pen:—

‘Sit mihi, primitiasque meas, tennesque triumphos  
 Sit, revocare tuos dulcis Etona! dies.  
 Auspice Te, summæ mirari culmina famæ,  
 Et purum antiquæ lucis adire jubar  
 Edidici puer, et jam primo in limite vitæ,  
 Ingenuas veræ laudis amare vias.’

It is, however, unnecessary, in reviewing ‘Tom Brown’s Schooldays,’ to enlarge upon this subject, for the book itself supplies an admirable illustration of the sources and of the force of the sentiment in question. But it would not be difficult to point out the defects of the system. We will confine ourselves to two remarks upon them. They are, we think, most glaring in those who become most distinguished under its operation. It is not a wholesome thing for any boy to

be so distinguished in arts and arms, as the head of a public school often is at eighteen: such premature distinction not unfrequently produces a kind and degree of priggishness which no subsequent experience of life can remedy. As to the inertness and childishness of the great mass which so much distressed Dr. Arnold, we would suggest that intellectual rather than moral remedies are likely to be beneficial. Martin, the young naturalist, introduced into '*Tom Brown's Schooldays*,' is a character which suggests a most important inquiry upon this head — whether, namely, a somewhat more flexible system of instruction, susceptible of modifications according to individual tastes, might not exercise a very happy moral influence over many of those who at present pass through our great schools in that state of apathetic indifference, which so often betrays men into the coarser forms of vice.

Such being the general system of our public schools, how was Dr. Arnold related to it? It is perhaps difficult, for any one who was not brought into personal relations with himself and his system, to answer the question satisfactorily; but judging from facts before the world, and especially from his life and correspondence, we should be inclined to say, that no two persons could be less like each other than the real Dr. Arnold of Rugby and the Dr. Arnold of '*Tom Brown's Schooldays*.' The special peculiarity of his character would seem to have been an intense and somewhat impatient fervour. To him and his admirers we owe the substitution of the word 'earnest' for its predecessor 'serious.' Good man as he most undoubtedly was, he could never learn not to fret himself because of the ungodly. He saw all kinds of evil with such keenness, and was so anxious for its removal or destruction, that he was hardly capable of forming a cool judgment on its extent or intensity. No one can read his earlier letters about Rugby, without seeing that he was far more keenly alive to the defects, than to the merits of the public school system. He was almost in despair at the 'awful wickedness' of boys of fourteen. He dreaded the 'low standard of opinion' prevalent amongst them. In fact he seems to have felt that the whole system was out of joint, and that he was at Rugby to set it right. The means on which he relied for this purpose, and the principles on which he disposed of them, are curiously characteristic, and can only be understood by reference to the facts of his life. Dr. Arnold went to Oxford with no experience of the world; he was a member of a rather narrow University clique. He took orders and married early, and passed the first years of his married life in the tuition of private pupils at Laleham, and in occasional tours on the

Continent. He seems to have read and speculated largely during this period on theology and politics, without having the opportunity of testing his theories by practice or of discussing them to any considerable extent either with his equals or his superiors. He thus elaborated that strange doctrine of the identity of Church and State, which to many persons appeared at one time the announcement of a new gospel, though its soundness may be estimated by the fact that its author declared that if the Jews were admitted to Parliament he should feel serious scruples about entering into legal proceedings except in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It was whilst his mind was full of this and cognate speculations that he was appointed to the Mastership of Rugby, and it is impossible not to see that the whole of his conduct there was strongly tinged by his wish to reduce them to practice. It has been usual to speak of his success in the attempt in terms of almost unqualified praise, and we do not for a moment deny that his management of the school had very high merits; but we think that it also reflected very clearly the defects of his character, especially those of his intellect. Whatever benefit boys could derive from living under the care of a man of perfect honesty, deep conscientiousness, sincere and fervent piety, and an energy and courage which almost became blemishes by their excess, the Rugby boys derived from Dr. Arnold. By the constant employment of these virtues, aided by a vigorous, original, and most independent understanding, and adorned by a literary reputation hardly exceeded by that of any contemporary, he not only raised the school to a very high pitch of prosperity, but undoubtedly succeeded in elevating the social position of schoolmasters in general, for he was the first person who proved by experiment that a man of first-rate powers and education might devote himself enthusiastically to that profession. His great merits have been so eloquently vindicated and so amply acknowledged, that it is unnecessary to dwell upon them here; and we hope that we shall not lay ourselves open to the imputation of wishing to carp at a great man, if, instead of giving an unreserved assent to the chorus of admiration which is raised in his honour, we point out some of the defects of a system and of a character which has been so unreservedly praised, that its very blemishes are eagerly copied in some of the most important schools in England.

In estimating Dr. Arnold's influence at Rugby, we must consider it under two heads. There was, in the first place, the general influence which his vigorous supervision and management exercised over the whole school, and of this we have nothing unfavourable to say: we believe, on the other hand, that it was

excellent. Secondly, there was an influence of a much narrower kind which Dr. Arnold exercised over the elder boys alone. The zeal which pervaded his whole character would have prevented him, we think, even if circumstances had allowed of intercourse with them, from sympathizing with or even understanding the younger boys; and it would seem to have given to his influence over the elder ones a very questionable complexion. At all events it harmonised ill with what we conceive to be the general spirit of public school education, and introduced into it an entirely new element. The great standing charge which Dr. Arnold brought against public school boys was the want of what he delighted to call 'moral thoughtfulness;' a phrase, which to those who remember its employment at the universities by the solemn array of Rugby præpositors, is associated with a most ludicrous recollection of old heads set upon young shoulders, and completely puzzled by their position. Such, however, was far from being Dr. Arnold's estimate of this cardinal virtue. To make his boys morally thoughtful was for him the substance of the law and the prophets. The total want of humour \* which characterised him prevented him from seeing that much of what he considered 'awful wickedness,' was mere fun, and that it was far less desirable than possible to turn boys into men before their time. It seems to have been his serious wish to bring boys to see a duty in every act of their lives, and to imitate his own habit of referring the most trifling matters to the most awful principles. There is a class of persons on whom it is extremely easy to produce this result. An imaginative sensitive boy of sixteen is more open to these than to almost any other impressions. When Dr. Arnold was himself of that age he was at college, amongst grown-up men, and he did not therefore know how boys at that time of life naturally feel upon such subjects. It is an age when sensibilities of all sorts want the bridle far more than the spur; for a lad is then first distinctly conscious of the degree in which his capacities will soon exceed the limits of the position in which he finds himself. Like a young horse who has no load and no rider, he begins, from mere wantonness, to rear, to kick,

---

\* We may mention, in illustration of this, an anecdote, which, whether true or not, shows at any rate the character which those who lived with Dr. Arnold attributed to him. A boy once answered to his name when called over by a '*Here*' which made the windows rattle, and excused himself by saying that, being of a nervous disposition, he was so frightened at hearing his name called, that his shout was involuntary. Instead of settling the question by a laugh and fifty lines of Virgil, Dr. Arnold solemnly consulted a physician to know whether this was possible.



and to think that the stout cobs who carry middle-aged gentlemen, and the sleek horses who draw prosaic carriages so quietly along the smooth roads, do not show in their daily labour half so much strength or resource as he does when he flings out his heels or rolls on the grass. If a touch of melancholy (as is so often the case) mingles with this stirring of the blood, it often takes the form of impatience at the puerility of school life. The lad wishes to make grand speeches in Parliament, to lead the storming party up a breach, to write poems which shall throw Shakspeare into the shade, to invent machines which shall supersede railroads and steamships. When a youth of this stamp hears from such a man as Arnold the sort of half truths which he communicated to his sixth form boys, he receives them as the very fulfilment of his dreams. He is told that the moral welfare here and hereafter of some four hundred boys depends, in a great degree, on his exertions. His master, the object of his idolatry, delegates to him the combined authority of the priest and the prophet. If there is evil in the house he is to hate it, to preach to it, and finally, to take a cane, and thrash it in the name of the Lord—an exercise which gratifies the old Adam, while it gives a grim satisfaction to the new. All the objects and incidents around him acquire a sort of new signification, and satisfy at once his love for theory, and his dread of seeing his theory confuted by facts. He never ties his shoes without asserting a principle; when he puts on his hat he ‘founds himself’ on an eternal truth. How can *arma virumque* be trivial; how can football be puerile; how can it be a vulgar incident to lick your fag for not toasting your sausages, when every motion of the tongue, hand, or foot involves the idea of the *πόλις*, and asserts the identity of the Christian Church with the Christian State? Conversely, who can be so hardy as to deny the truth of the theory in the face of the fact? Sceptics and quibblers can never disconnect the civil and religious functions of life, whilst members of parliament swear on the true faith of a Christian, and the præpositors of Rugby brandish their canes and cry silence.

It is curious to see how even now the ‘Old Boy’ is under the charm. In any one but a Rugbœan the importance which he attaches to the merest trifles would be quite unintelligible. He finds as many morals in a boxing match as Mr. Ruskin does in the twist of a gargoyle’s tail, or the shape of a wallflower’s root. It asserts the great truth, that life is all a battle, that it is our great business to fight, and so forth; in short, it is one of a hundred excuses for taking up the cry—In the name of the prophet, Figs. ‘Floreat pugilatus’ by all means, but leave the

gloves to depend on their natural charms, and far be the day when these will not be enough to teach English boys the final cause of their fists. Do we honour them the less for finding no moral in them?

‘ If you find no moral there,  
Go look in any glass and say,  
What moral lies in being fair;  
Or, to what uses shall we put  
The wildweed flower that sweetly grows;  
Or is there any moral shut  
Within the blossom of the rose.

And liberal applications lie  
In Art like Nature, dearest friend,  
So ’t were to cramp their use if we  
Should hook them to some useful end.’\*

The same temper is even more strangely shown in Tom Brown’s reasons for thinking that Rugby in his day was ‘perhaps the only spot of England well and strongly ruled.’ Incredible as it may appear, Dr. Arnold actually contrived, by an elaborate policy, to abolish the scandal of ‘island fagging.’ It appears that there was a sort of island in one corner of the close of Rugby in which the sixth form had gardens; that there was an ill-used race of fags who tilled the soil, sowed the seed, and reaped the harvest, with enduring toil, for the purpose of producing flowers to ornament the school-room at the Easter speeches; and that it was customary to supply deficiencies by a raid on the gardens of peaceful citizens. Tom Brown is penetrated with wonder at Dr. Arnold’s wisdom in getting the better of this giant abuse. He first changed the time of his speeches, then he artfully suggested that the sixth form might put up gymnastic poles on the island; and thus island fagging and garden robbing died a quasi natural death, and Tom Brown learnt a great moral lesson about ‘planting a good thing in the place of a bad one.’ The story, we must say, reminds us of Hogarth’s picture of the quack doctor’s elaborate machine for drawing corks.

---

\* Dr. Hawtrey’s view of fisticuffs was very different from Tom Brown’s heroics. Two lads taken with the mainour close in front of his chambers, received the following admonition, given with a very unsuccessful attempt at gravity: ‘Well, boys will quarrel, and I suppose if they do they had better fight; but you need not do it just before my door.’ Indeed we have heard that even at Rugby such things had not always such very deep meanings. ‘Come, boys, come, you must not fight on an empty stomach,’ was the admonition given by one of the Rugby masters to a pair of matutinal gladiators.

Why not abolish the custom at once? Heaven and earth would have remained apart, and even the fearful sixth form would have survived their searchings of heart. Eton was full of old customs, but Dr. Hawtrey put them down when he thought proper, with an iron hand, little thinking that he was guilty of culpable rashness. As the genealogical Chief Justice counted up the extinctions of the Bohuns, the Veres, and the Plantagenets, in his application of the text about the fashion of this world, so we may look back upon the traditions of youth. What has become of cricket fagging? Where are rug-ridings, college hidings, and all the common law of Long Chamber? and, 'what 'is more, and most of all,' where is Eton Montem?

We would not be understood to deride the importance of the influence exercised by the elder boys at a public school. Still less should we wish to imply that the sanctions of religion do not apply to the common affairs of life, to those of boys no less than those of men; and no one can doubt that Dr. Arnold did excellent service in denouncing and exposing the falsehood of that division of life into secular and spiritual, which was in his time even more prevalent and even more mischievous than it is now. We admit, and would, if necessary, assert as strongly as he did, that there is but one right and one wrong; and that to suppose that there are moral virtues which are unrecognised by religion, is little less false and dangerous than to suppose that there are religious graces which are independent of morality; but we differ from him and from his eulogist in thinking that it is most undesirable to be in the constant habit of referring every action to the great fundamental principles of right and wrong. In practice it is impossible and undesirable not to look upon a very large proportion of human actions as indifferent. Men have only a limited amount of time and strength at their disposal. 'Life,' it has been nobly said, 'is not long enough for scruples.' We ought to direct our view to the weightier matters of the law, and leave the mint and cummin to take care of themselves. An ingenious person may make his acceptance or refusal of an invitation depend upon his view of the source of moral obligation, but he had much better not, for he will either solve his problem wrongly after all, or else he will waste upon it far more time than it is worth. The temptation to act thus is particularly strong upon boys and unmarried women. They have nothing to do which is at once important and open to doubt. That a boy at school ought to learn his lesson, that a grown-up daughter ought to nurse her mother if she is ill, or teach her little brothers to read, or at any rate to dress as well as she can, and play on the piano, are self-evident truths, and therefore there is

no conscious effort to be good, no assertion of a cherished principle in acting accordingly; and thus the craving after the exercise of an important discretion has to satisfy itself on trifles. Nothing is easier than to get up mock important business by linking small results to great principles. A præpostor's cane, which is a penny cane and nothing more, may hit or miss, as it happens. Turn it into the sword of the Lord and of Gideon, and you may well argue for an hour about unsheathing it. Such practices are very unwholesome. They not only stimulate a diseased consciousness, but they are pretty sure to deaden the feelings of a hard nature, and to upset the balance of a soft one.

From what we have said, it will appear that in our view of the case it was Dr. Arnold's special characteristic that he innovated largely on the principles on which public schools are generally conducted; and it therefore seems strange that so ardent an advocate of those principles as the author of *Tom Brown* should feel such unqualified admiration for him. It is, however, quite clear, upon comparing *Tom Brown's* Dr. Arnold with Mr. Stanley's, that they are very different people. All the most essential features of the second character are wanting in the first. *Tom Brown* hardly notices any one feature of the course of study at Rugby. He gives the impression that it was an immense playground, in which the boys, having the gift of prophecy, talked like the characters in Mr. Kingsley's novels. We have no more than a few hints about the personal intercourse which Dr. Arnold so kindly and characteristically carried on with his elder pupils, or of the great changes which he made in introducing modern history and languages into the school curriculum. The book suggests the conclusion that the author's personal relations with his master when at school were comparatively slight; that he afterwards learnt to admire and understand him; and that he now looks back upon him and his system through a sort of halo, shed upon them by the light of Mr. Kingsley's writings. On no other supposition can we account for his determination throughout to look upon Dr. Arnold as an incarnation of the virtues especially lauded by that very eloquent and popular writer. Dr. Arnold differed as widely as possible from this ideal in two very essential points. He was worthy of the very highest respect and admiration; but few men were less simple or unconscious. He was full of scruples. He had scruples about taking orders at all; when he became a deacon he felt a scruple about being ordained priest. He seems throughout life to have looked upon the profession of the law as being 'a grievous snare.' He was, in short, constantly harassed and

exercised, if not by doubts yet by theories, which never would square with the facts of the world. All this is quite opposed to the spirit in which the author of 'Tom Brown' writes, and to the sort of character which he extols. It is hardly less strange to make Dr. Arnold a patron saint of athleticism. His letters often refer to the Rugby amusements, but they give no proof that he took the sort of view of them which is taken by 'Tom Brown.' On the contrary, the exuberant animal spirits of the boys filled him with a sort of sorrow. He seems to wish that they were chastened by some sterner influences. 'When the spring and activity of youth,' he wrote, 'is altogether unsanctified by anything pure and elevated in its desires, it becomes a spectacle that is as dizzying, and almost more morally distressing, than the shouts and gambols of a set of lunatics. It is very startling to see so much of sin combined with so little of sorrow. In a parish, amongst the poor, whatever of sin exists, there is sure also to be enough of suffering; poverty, sickness, and old age are mighty tamers and chastisers. But with boys of the richer classes, one sees nothing but plenty, health, and youth; and these are really awful to behold, when one must feel that they are unblessed.' No one would discover from the book under review that these were Dr. Arnold's feelings; or if they were, that its author shared them.

The view which it takes of Dr. Arnold's character leads us to the remark that 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' has one claim to attention which is quite independent of its relations to Rugby or to its master. It represents, not only fairly but favourably, a school of feeling rather than thought, which, though small, is becoming very influential in the hands of zealous and eloquent teachers. It is a school of which Mr. Kingsley is the ablest doctor; and its doctrine has been described fairly and cleverly as 'muscular Christianity.' The principal characteristics of the writer whose works earned this burlesque though expressive description, are his deep sense of the sacredness of all the ordinary relations and all the common duties of life, and the vigour with which he contends for the merits of simple massive unconscious goodness, and for the great importance and value of animal spirits, physical strength, and a hearty enjoyment of all the pursuits and accomplishments which are connected with them. We entirely agree in the truth and importance of the first and last of these opinions; nor do we think that many persons would dissent from them when they are stated categorically. They are closely connected with the whole Protestant conception of life; and we do not think that Englishmen as a body are fairly chargeable with their neglect or denial.

The propriety of Mr. Kingsley's admiration of simplicity and unconsciousness strikes us as more questionable. Indeed, constantly as the words are used by a certain class of writers, we are not quite sure that we understand what they refer to. If we were perfect members of a perfect world, we might be unconscious of our own perfection; but, as things are, we hardly see how a man can be unconscious of goodness unless he is dead to its antagonism to vice. Such a person is like nothing so much as a man who with a keen eye for darkness is insensible to light. As to simplicity, we are equally puzzled. We understand what is meant by a massive understanding. Bacon's mind was massive; Hooker's was massive; that of Hobbes was pre-eminently massive. But in what sense were they simple? The facts of life are far too complex to be embraced by an understanding which only recognises a few broad divisions. Many most essential distinctions are to the last degree refined. How would the simple understanding discriminate between pride and vanity, or between pride and self-respect? How would it deal with the Bank Charter Act, or apply the theory of rent unfolded by Ricardo? Are the writers with whom Mr. Kingsley himself is most intimately associated remarkable for simplicity? Mr. Maurice is almost his *alter ego*, but would any human creature reckon the gift in question amongst the many virtues of that excellent person? If simplicity means something which can be predicated of the sort of mind which produced the 'Theological Essays' and the 'Kingdom of Christ,' it fairly baffles our comprehension.

Whatever may be the truth upon these subjects, there are very various ways in which it may be taught; and we fear that that which Mr. Kingsley has invented, and which the author of 'Tom Brown' has followed up, is open to very grave objections. It consists of writing novels, the hero of which is almost always drawn in the most glowing colours, and intended to display the excellence of a simple massive understanding united with the almost unconscious instinct to do good, and adorned, generally speaking, with every sort of athletic accomplishment. If, as we suppose, it is Mr. Kingsley's object to invigorate the minds of his contemporaries, to make them simpler, stronger, and more manly, we do not think he is taking quite the right course for that end.\* His novels are calculated to produce an artistic admiration for simplicity and vigour, rather than simplicity and vigour themselves; and these things are not only

---

\* Our observations apply principally to his novels: The 'Village Sermons' are written, we think, in a somewhat different spirit.

independent of, but are to a certain extent opposed to, each other. Nothing is more common than to admire the qualities in which we are deficient; and as Jeffery Hudson, in 'Peveril of the Peak,' is constantly envying every one a few inches taller than his neighbours, we should fear that the grand simple giants in 'Yeast,' 'Alton Locke,' and 'Westward Ho,' would be particularly welcome to the febrile, irritable, over-excited part of the generation to which they are addressed, and we do not think that such reading would be likely to calm or to brace their nerves. Nothing can do that efficiently but strong exercise of mind and body, and abstinence from the stimulants appropriate to each. Mr. Kingsley's novels are powerful stimulants, and lead their readers not to take exercise but to dream of taking it. He is a man of whom we wish on every account to speak with the respect which is so justly due to his genius and to his kindness, but we are bound to say that the intellectual gifts which his novels display are very unlike the simple athletic understanding, and the calm self-possessed good sense, which he rates so highly. Compare Mr. Kingsley's speculations with Butler or Bentham; compare his political and social disquisitions with Cobbett, and the difference between massiveness and ingenuity, strong thinking and strong feeling, are very curiously illustrated. Even the characters introduced into his novels are not really strong. Their massiveness usually shows itself principally in their muscular development. We cannot think, for example, that a man who, like Paul Tregarva, is driven to the verge of madness by the spectacle of the state of the poor in England, is entitled to be called a strong character. In 'Two Years Ago' there is a simple-minded Scotch soldier, who is the virtuous giant of the book, yet he has so little force of character as to let the heroine make an utter fool of him. A chance word from her changes the whole course of his life; and after her marriage, he carries about with him an affection for her which he has not the force to overcome, and which makes him welcome death in the very flower of his age. Such a man is essentially weak, whatever may be the breadth of his pectoral muscles. Subtract the physical force from any one of Mr. Kingsley's heroes, and he loses all his character.

The praise which Mr. Kingsley lavishes on athletic accomplishments is, we think, rather overdone. No doubt his books contain much evidence of a very vigorous appreciation of the pleasures of such pursuits, but they are not quite natural. They read like a constant reiteration of the assertion that a man may be made to walk a thousand miles in a thousand hours, and also to subordinate the Neoplatonist philosophy. 'Tom Brown' certainly

does not err in this respect. Every line of it tingles with animal life; but it, as well as Mr. Kingsley's books, is open to the objection that, not content with asserting the value of bodily strength, it throws by implication a certain slur on intellectual strength, which, when all is said and done, is much more important. No doubt strong muscles and hardy nerves are of incalculable importance, but they derive that importance from the mind, of which they are the servants; and though Mr. Kingsley would willingly admit this, and probably means his books to imply it, we do not think they would convey this impression to an ordinary reader.

In 'Tom Brown' this failing is exaggerated. Compare it with 'Frank' or 'Sandford and Merton.' The very first lesson which little Master Tommy is taught in the last-named book is to dig and to walk; and Harry Sandford's combat with the bully, Master Mash, is as spirited as the fight between Tom Brown and Williams: so, too, Frank's father carefully teaches him to ride and leap, but neither Day nor Miss Edgeworth allow their readers to forget for a moment that riding, walking, and boxing, though admirable things, are only means, and not ends. A boy might really infer from 'Tom Brown' that he was only sent to school to play at football, and that the lessons were quite a secondary consideration. If we are right in thinking that the works under consideration are liable to these objections, the fact is a curious proof of the way in which people contradict themselves, for there can be no doubt that severe mental labour requires the rarest and most enduring form of bodily strength—namely, strength of the digestive organs and nervous system.

Having, however, exhausted our criticisms, we must conclude as we began, by giving our hearty thanks for a very charming book. It is one which does great honour, not only to the author and to Rugby, but to the school of fiction to which it belongs. We heartily congratulate Mr. Kingsley on a disciple who reproduces so vigorously many of his own great merits, and who sympathizes so ardently in feelings which we do not entirely share, but which are generous even in their defects.



ART. VII. — *Mémoires et Journal sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de Bossuet*. Publiés pour la première fois d'après les Manuscrits autographes de l'Abbé Le Dieu, et accompagnés d'une Introduction et de Notes par M. l'Abbé Guettée. 4 vols. Paris: 1856-57.

THE appearance of these *Memoirs* is singularly encouraging to all authors who are waiters upon fortune and aspirants to posthumous fame. The Abbé Le Dieu evidently thought well of them: he read them to this person and to that. One praised the style, another the choice of facts, another the lucid order; and the Jesuit Père de la Rue, who used them in the funeral oration which he pronounced over Bossuet, even declared them to be eloquent; and now at length, after a century and a half, the manuscripts have found a publisher. The Abbé Guettée, a liberal Catholic and a firm Gallican, the author of an industrious history of the Church of France, has gone through the duty of editing these documents,—an undertaking which he has conscientiously discharged, subjoining many useful notes, and prefixing a judicious introduction.

The Abbé Le Dieu, who may now be known to posterity as the author of these *Memorials*, was for twenty years the private secretary of Bossuet, the confidant of his thoughts and labours. The life of Bossuet contained in the *Memoirs* appears to have been composed partly from notes taken from Bossuet's own lips and partly from personal observation; the *Journal* is a diary kept by the Abbé himself. Cardinal de Beausset had both *Memoirs* and *Journal* before him, and so filled three volumes with the somewhat pompous history which bears his name. M. Floquet too, in the three volumes which he published on Bossuet's early life, has added little to the facts here related.

The Abbé's *Journal*, however, only extends over the last four years of the life of the prelate; indeed the last volume and a half contains events subsequent to Bossuet's death,—the dissatisfaction which the next M. de Meaux gave, the *petit fripon* as Bossuet called him, who did not know even how to say mass—the great dispute about the deanery—details about the publication of Bossuet's works—how the furniture of the next bishop was better than that of Bossuet—church separations, and the affairs of the synod. The Abbé had little notion of artistic grouping or selection: he turns his reflecting-glass round in every direction, and notes down whatever it takes in

without distinction. Nevertheless there is a stamp of sincerity about the narrative; and we read with much pleasure the details he has given us of the great patriarch of the Gallican Church. We wish this faithful servitor had considered Bossuet the man worthy of as much attention as Bossuet the churchman, and had given us less of the routine of his ecclesiastical and diocesan duties and more of his ordinary conversation and deportment. But the Abbé Le Dieu was no Boswell or Eckerman, and we must remain content to see only of Bossuet what the Abbé Le Dieu saw in him, and to hear only what the Abbé Le Dieu thought worth hearing. The grandeur and sublimity of his master were evidently subdued by familiarity to the domestic chaplain, and now and then touches of *naïveté* escape him which recall the old adage that no man is a hero to his attendant.

Yet the very birth and cradle of Bossuet seem to have been placed under the protection of that religion of which he was destined to become so illustrious a defender. Jacques Benigne Bossuet was born at Dijon, on the night of the 27th of September, 1627. He was the seventh son of an honourable *bourgeois* family, who had occupied seats in the parliament of Dijon. The name Benigne was taken from the patron saint of his native city, after whom the principal church is called. There is still extant a journal kept in Latin, in the handwriting of his aged grandfather. The birth of this child is noted with the following quotation: '*Circumduxit eum et custodivit quasi pupillum oculi.*' After having as a boy shown an astonishing aptitude for learning, the true character of his genius was disclosed by the perusal of a copy of the Bible found in his father's library. The harmonious pomp of Virgil, and the sounding sublimity of Homer, ceased to engross his youthful and ardent imagination, from the time that the rapt inspirations of the Hebrew Prophets, and the inexhaustible treasures of Divine Love and Wisdom, were spread before his fervid imagination: that hallowed fire kindled his faculties with unquenchable enthusiasm, which failed not amid the temptations of the world, the chills of age, the racks of a most painful illness, and the agonies of death. When we read that he received the tonsure at eight years of age, and that he was a canon of the cathedral of Metz at thirteen, we call to mind the biblical figure of the infant Samuel. At fifteen, the scene of his studies was removed from the college of the Jesuits at Dijon to that of Navarre in Paris. It was fated that the young canon, on his first entrance into the capital, should be the spectator of a scene which must for ever have remained fixed in an imagination so eager to mark the sublime and the awful in the vicissitudes of human destiny. He found the walls

of the city laid open to admit a slow and solemn procession,—the streets lined with chains to restrain the curiosity of the populace, while Richelieu was conveyed to his death-bed in the Palais Cardinal. Yet a few days more, and the youthful Bossuet saw his inanimate form on a bier of state, decked in the parade of death, and heard the masses chanted for the soul of the great statesman, who while he held her phlegmatic and aimless monarch in subjection, raised France to the rank of the first power in Europe.

Immediately on his arrival in Paris he was brought into contact with the most polished society of the capital. Such a society must have exercised a most potent influence on a mind like that of Bossuet, who united the strength of will and clear vision of a man to the boundless impetuosity of youth. His family was not unconnected with persons in high station. The astounding precocity of the young ecclesiastic was vaunted at the Hôtel de Rambouillet. The great ladies and brilliant wits who assembled there were desirous to see and hear the prodigy. He appeared one evening—a text was given him, and the subject of the sermon prescribed. After a short pause for reflection, Bossuet preached a sermon which was rapturously applauded. The preacher was then only sixteen, and the *bel esprit* Voiture declared, ‘qu’il n’avait jamais oui prêcher ni ‘si tôt ni si tard.’ This *mot* served to make Bossuet’s name known to all the notabilities of Paris. M. de Cospeau, Bishop of Lisieux, a prelate of great piety and learning, hearing of this sermon, was himself eager to be the witness of a similar improvisation. The experiment was repeated before himself and two other bishops. The prelates were struck with admiration at the learning and eloquence of the youthful student. M. de Cospeau warned him, with friendly counsel, against being led away by a vain love of premature display; and, still more pleased with Bossuet’s modest bearing, exclaimed that he was born to be one of the great lights of the Church.

The modesty of Bossuet, indeed, was too great and his aspirations too noble to allow him to be corrupted by secular admiration, and he continued to apply himself to the study of sacred and profane eloquence with an industry as remarkable as his genius. St. Augustine approached the font of baptism after the fervid passions of youth had been exhausted in licence; and in the untimely fate of Adeodatus he bewailed at once the evidence and the punishment of his early aberrations. But doubt and dissipation never led astray the early steps of Bossuet. His enemy, Madame de Montespan, declared in after life, that the most searching inquiries had elicited no

fact which could cast a shadow of suspicion on his youth or manhood: he lived from the first a spotless life, as though he respected the sanctity of his genius.

\* 'Illi purpureus pudor, et sine labe juvenus  
Grata fuit.'

Undiverted by the allurements of youth, his energies were concentrated in preparing for his holy calling. He disdained not the aid of profane studies. The great exemplars of Greece and Rome were ever in his hands. From the 'Pro Ligario' and the 'De Coronâ,'—from the indignant brevity of Tacitus and the serried strength of Thucydides,—he drew that vigour of style which, when enriched by the sublime imagery of the prophets and the tender pathos of the Evangelists and early Fathers, placed him amongst the first of Christian orators. To an immense aptitude for eloquence he united a prodigious memory; and in his most advanced age he was able to recite long and favourite pieces of the writers and poets of Greece and Rome. He passed his different degrees and acquitted himself of his Theses in a manner which attracted the rapturous admiration of his audience and the applause of his superiors. The great Condé, present on one occasion, was so excited by the young theologian's ability, that he was almost tempted to hazard his laurels won in other fields by entering the lists as a volunteer against the young disputant.

For every fresh consecration to the service of the Church Bossuet prepared himself with deep humility and a solemn sense of the important duties he was about to undertake. What greater proof can be shown of the earnestness with which he received the degree of Doctor, than that just before his death he repeated from memory the peroration of his Latin discourse on that occasion, in which he devoted his body and soul to the defence of truth with the fervent spirit of an early Christian martyr? It remained for him to receive the priesthood; and to do it worthily he placed himself under the spiritual direction of St. Vincent de Paul at Saint Lazare. St. Vincent de Paul recognised his aspiring genius, and subjected him to the guidance of the most simple and pious ecclesiastic of the seminary,—a lesson in the deferencé due from intellect to character and virtue. Refusing all offers of advancement in Paris, and flying from the seductions of the brilliant society of the Hôtels de Nevers and Rambouillet, Bossuet betook himself to Metz, and there for the next six years he still devoted himself to an immense course of theological study, and gained that intimate acquaintance with the spirit, the doctrine, and the language of the Fathers, with the

history of the Church, its councils and decretals, which distinguished him above all his contemporaries.

The state of France during this period must have tended to confirm a mind loving stability and hating doubt in that spirit of resolute dogmatism which marked his religious and political life. Scarcely were the Spanish standards captured at Sens carried in triumph to Notre Dame, when a storm, which had long been brooding, burst in the interior of France. The elements of disorder, which the strong spirit of the Cardinal de Richelieu had kept in subjection, broke forth on all sides. The recent wars had necessitated enormous taxes; discontent was rife in town and country; the parliament, so long the ally of the monarchy against the aristocracy, was ambitious of independent action; the mutinous spirit of the *noblesse*, no longer curbed by a ruthless policy, threatened again to seize the brand of civil warfare. The halls of the Palais resounded with the declamations of Molé and Talon against state abuses; the young counsellors uttered magnificent harangues, says the 'Parliament Journal,' which had in them something of old Rome. Anne of Austria was exasperated that the *canaille*, as she termed the aristocracy of the bar, should attempt to limit that royal power which had subjugated the aristocracy of the sword. The arrest of Broussel, the *protecteur du peuple*, was the signal of open revolt. Paris became an entrenched camp. When Condé besieged the capital, Bossuet, to provide against contingencies, slept with four sacks of corn under his bed. Another day of barricades recalled the days of the League; and Paul de Gondi, who united the demagogic arts of a Gracchus to the profligacy and genius of a Sallust, became for a while the dictator of the capital. The Royalty, which it had taken five centuries to perfect, seemed on the point of perishing. Anne was at one time obliged to fly with the young Louis to St. Germain, and take refuge in the deserted château on beds of straw; at another time she was a prisoner in the Palais Royal, and obliged to show the boy-king asleep to quell the suspicions of an insurgent population.

Religious parties exhibited the same collision of opinion and authority. Although the fall of Rochelle had averted the civil sword from the Huguenots, although the strong places recognised by the Edict of Nantes were dismantled, although the culverin no longer peered over the castle wall of the Huguenot cavalier—through the pulpit and the press they still continued the war on the ancient faith; their ministers still continued to thunder in their temples against the harlotries of Babylon, the tyranny of Pharaoh, and to lament the misfortunes of the house

of Israel. The sectarian spirit was, however, sufficiently relieved by these fiery declamations; and the glorious edict of Henri IV., had produced such good effects that no attempt was made by the Huguenot party to take advantage of the troubles\* of the Fronde. But, on the other side, the victorious party were less moderate. *Cahier* after *cahier* was sent up by the assemblies of the Catholic clergy, complaining of the liberty of the Protestants and their unrelenting zeal of proselytism. The Catholic population followed the lead of the clergy; and the scars of civil broil were green in the minds of men in whose houses still hung the cross-bows and arquebuses that had done good service in the wars of the League. The Government was of necessity predisposed to treat the Huguenots with greater severity than the Catholics. The Catholics, attached to tradition both in Church and State, might be relied on to support that administrative unity which was the traditional policy of the French Monarchy; whilst the ecclesiastical polity and the social ties of the Huguenots attached them to the Protestant and republican communities of Switzerland, England, and Holland.

It is not surprising that to a fervent Catholic like Bossuet the doctrines of the new faith seemed fraught with perdition to mankind. He saw immemorial authority treated with scorn; the old landmarks torn up; the guiding voice of the Church neglected, and the lost sheep straying wilfully in the wilderness of sin and death. To use the words of the Apocalypse, the mouth of the bottomless pit was opened, the smoke of it blotted out the sun and heavens, and in blind bewilderment countless souls were engulfed to irredeemable perdition. The past century had been filled with deeds of horror. Wherever the new doctrine had been preached, the earth had reddened with carnage or blackened with homicidal fire. From the first it was clear that rebellion would follow heresy, and that the right of private judgment would not be restrained to things spiritual. With the aid of the Gospel Luther withstood popes, councils, and decretals; with the same ally Munzer raised the German peasant to revolt against kings and princes. Peace was secure in no part of Europe except Spain, and that was the peace of the charnel-house. The follies of the Anabaptist, and the theocratic extravagance of John of Leyden, were inspired alike by the same spirit of reform and love of novelty which animated Zwinglius and Calvin; and a grey, disrowned head had lately fallen on the scaffold of Whitehall, whose fate Bossuet could logically deduce from the schismatic intemperance of Henry VIII.

Within the bosom of the Church of Rome a furious conflict had been carried on with mutual exasperation for more than thirty years; and when the doctors should have fought in one spirit against the enemy without, they were themselves raging against each other with the utmost rancour within. The institution which Ignatius Loyola had conceived in the gloomy depths of the cavern of Manreza had now overrun the whole earth. The Jesuits were the priests militant of the Papacy, and did battle against heresy and infidelity with craft and compliance—weapons more insidious and more effective than the lance and shield of the Templars and Hospitallers of old. The moral force in the hands of the General was such as no man had ever wielded before. It was impossible, however, but that in an age when religious faith was earnest and universal, the rapid rise of the Jesuits should meet with violent antagonism. The Catholic clergy viewed this upstart society with suspicion, and looked with jealousy on their rising churches, colleges, schools, and immense wealth; and the aged priest of the parish was deserted for the glozing tongue and supple morality of the Jesuit confessor. On points of mere morality it had not been easy to engage them in a general conflict. When therefore the Jesuit Molina sent forth the Concord of Free Will and Grace, and revived the heresy of Pelagius, their foes at once seized this unskilfully advanced outwork of Jesuitism as the point of attack.

The battle-field on which the disciples of Jansenius joined issue with the disciples of Loyola, is one which has probably existed ever since man awoke to a consciousness of his destiny. In the intellectual, as in the material world, forms change, substances and ideas remain the same. The spirit of St. Augustine was alone equal to cope with the new heresy. By a six times repeated study of the ponderous folios of the Bishop of Hippo, Cornelius Jansen had endeavoured to wake the genius of the great master, and composed that terrible volume the 'Augustinus,' in the desolate depths of whose metaphysical subtleties were supposed to be hidden the five mysterious propositions which had killed Jacqueline Pascal, and drawn conflicting discussions from Infallibility itself. St. Cyran, the fellow-student of Jansen at Somme, St. Cyran preached to the world that doctrine which his fellow-pupil elaborated in his study. The spiritual regeneration of the spiritual man, and consequently a less need of priestly mediation, and a most austere morality, were the main distinctions of the creed with which the Jansenists carried on successful war. Genius and eloquence, wealth and beauty, swelled their ranks. The earnestness, faith, and unconquerable courage of ardent converts supported them in

the deadly conflict against crafty foes supported by the fulminating edicts of Rome, by decrees of exile and imprisonment; but though the Jesuits triumphed for a while, and the asylum of Pascal, Arnauld, and Racine was uprooted, and the plough driven over its foundations by the ferocious Letellier; though the sacred remains of the glorious anchorites were scattered to the air; let none think, because the cause of quarrel now seems obsolete, that their lives were wasted, their talents and energies absorbed, in the defence of a vain theological riddle: wherever truth is loved and hypocrisy abhorred, these names will ever be held in honour.

The influence of Jansenism on Bossuet was great. The Jansenists abjured Protestantism, and yet were Romanizing Protestants. Bossuet repudiated Jansenism, and yet participated largely in its doctrines: he was as vehement against the flagitious immorality of Sanchez, Suarez, and Escobar, as the most fervent disciple of Port Royal, and declared he would sooner have written the 'Provinciales' than any other book of the age. Like Jansenius, he owned St. Augustine as the father of his predilection, and in many a hard-fought battle the weighty authority of the Bishop of Hippo decided the controversy. It was impossible, too, for a nature like Bossuet's to withhold his sympathy from the great character of Arnauld, the dauntless athlete of the Jansenists, whose life was a combat, and who looked alone to eternity for repose. What, too, must have been the wonder of the young ecclesiastic when the pale and noble form of Pascal appeared in the lists, — who knew no day without pain, who lived as if the sound of the last trumpet rang in his ears and an ever-open gulf yawned by his side, whose soul was shattered and lamp of life extinguished by the fierce conflict within him of the True and the Good for mastery and utterance. Launched in the midst of this civil and sectarian turmoil, when the human mind seemed a shifting quicksand lashed by the fury and storm of opinions in collision, Bossuet determined to plant on the rock of Authority a beacon to warn the sea-tost mariner from the perilous coast.

When he left the schools of Paris he had already acquired the reputation of a consummate theologian. But extraordinary men like Bossuet begin their education where ordinary men finish it. At Metz he reformed his education anew. Seventeen years of incessant study were relieved by the charm of family intercourse, by occasional visits to Paris to deliver courses of sermons, and by an unremitting attendance on his duties in the cathedral. At morning and at eventide his fine clear voice was heard leading the chorus of Divine praise, and rising above the



swell of organ symphony. Few men, it must be allowed, ever possessed such advantages as Bossuet for the uninterrupted pursuit of knowledge. He never doubted an instant in the line he was to pursue. Poverty and disease, that fell pair, never distracted his attention; his profession relieved him from all domestic cares; he had full liberty to bend his whole soul and energies to the accomplishment of those tasks which he felt he was marked by the hand of Providence to fulfil. The mere recital of Bossuet's numerous labours while at Metz would terrify the student of light literature of our age; but Bossuet lived in a time when St. Augustine and the '*Augustinus*' were to be seen in the boudoir, and the chat of the *salons* touched on the efficacy of Grace or the '*Traité de la Méthode*.' Later in life, people marvelled at the facility with which he threw off, one after the other, treatises full of encyclopædic learning from the Fathers, but they little knew how large a portion of his youth had been spent at Metz in drawing inspiration from the fiery spirit of Tertullian, — '*ce dur Africain*,' as he termed him, the Tacitus of a persecuted church; from the allegoric genius of Origen, the pathetic eloquence of Basil, the earnest vehemence of Gregory of Nazianzen, and the Asiatic abundance of Chrysostom. But his companion by day and night, abroad and at home, his master, his counsellor, and his model, was St. Augustine. His copy of the '*De Civitate Dei*,' the Psalms of St. Augustine, and his treatises against the Pelagians, were worn with constant use, the margins scribbled over with countless notes; and he was accustomed to boast, that every portion of the writings of St. Augustine — '*ce maître si maître, le docteur des docteurs, l'aigle des Pères*' — might be traced in some one or other of his own compositions.

At length he ventured to appear in the pulpits of Paris: the public expectation was great; wherever he was to preach, the doors were beset by an impatient audience. The queen-mother desired to hear him, and was moved to tears; the discourse made so deep an impression, that she desired it to be repeated after two years' interval. One sermon was the talk of the town, and was known as '*Le Surrexit Paulus de M. l'Abbé Bossuet*.' It was clear that a revolution was made in pulpit oratory, and that Bossuet was the Corneille of the pulpit. The learned pedantry of Cheminais and Desmares, even the laboured rhetoric of Mascaron and Flechier, were at once displaced by his fresh and impetuous vigour. The most eminent doctors of Port Royal followed him from church to church, astounded at his clear exposition of doctrine, and the force and grandeur of his style. Condé, Turenne, the Cardinal

de Bouillon, and the secretary Le Tellier, became his eager admirers and friends; and, finally, the King himself appointed him to preach the Advent of 1661 at the Louvre. During the space of ten years, the churches and chapels of Paris, and the court, resounded with Bossuet's inexhaustible eloquence. His reputation was so well established, that, in 1665, M. de Peres, Archbishop of Paris, appointed him to preach the opening discourse at the meeting of the Synod of Paris. The queen-mother came constantly to hear him, but her premature death arrested her plans for his advancement. He was the director of the repentant Duchess of Longueville. When noble ladies took the veil, Bossuet was asked to celebrate their last solemn farewell; and dying courtiers claimed his consolation amid the agonies of a death-bed repentance. His fervent zeal prepared Turenne for conversion; and the great Condé was so charmed when he defended the privileges of the theological faculty that he embraced him before the court. Arnauld, at the close of a conference at which Bossuet was present, declared that he had learnt more from Bossuet in two or three hours than in a long course of study. But, amid all the temptations of increasing celebrity, he loved the seclusion of his quiet abode in the house of an old fellow-student of the College of Navarre, where he passed his hours of leisure in the society of friends of similar literary and serious tastes with himself; and every year after his course of sermons was preached in Paris, he returned regularly to his duties in the cathedral of Metz. His congregation saw the man whose eloquence was the wonder of the capital, resume with unassuming regularity his duties in the choir; his nights were passed again in solitary studies, and his days in giving instruction to converts and in ministration to the poor and sick.

The Abbé Le Dieu gives us some interesting details of the manner of composition of his sermons. He dashed rapidly down on paper texts, citations, and arguments suitable to the subject and occasion; in the morning of the day on which he was to preach he meditated deeply on this rough document, developing his discourse in his mind — writing he found distracted his attention, — and in this way he passed mentally through his sermon two or three times, reading the paper before him, and altering and improving as though the whole were written. Bossuet never ascended the pulpit without having in private prostrated himself at the foot of his crucifix to implore the Divine assistance: he frequently devoured with rapt attention some pages of the Gospel. On one occasion when he had to preach on the Decalogue, he threw himself on his knees and

read with a voice quivering with emotion, from the book of Exodus, how the people of Israel trembled when they saw and heard the lightnings and thunders of Sinai, the redoubled sound of the trumpet, and the awful voice from the cloud upon the Mount. In the pulpit, his majestic mien and bearing imposed a silent awe, which those who have seen his bust in the Louvre can well realise. His hair, prematurely grey, clustered down to his shoulders; his eyes cast a glance of power from beneath his well-arched eyebrows, like Sordello, 'Riguardando a guisa di leon quando si posa;' his nose was aquiline and well-formed; his face was oval; his cheeks straight and shaven; his mouth gracefully cut, and on the upper lip a slight moustache gave somewhat of a martial air not unbecoming to one pre-eminently regarded as the militant leader of the church whose sacred symbol, the cross, glittered on his breast. His action at first was dignified and reserved; he confined himself to the notes before him; gradually he warmed with his subject, the contagion of his enthusiasm seized his hearers; he watched their rising emotion; the rooted glances of a thousand eyes excited him with a sort of divine frenzy; his notes became a burden and a hindrance; with impetuous ardour he abandoned himself to the inspiration of the moment; with the eyes of the soul he watched the swelling hearts of his hearers; their concentrated emotion became his own; he felt within himself the collected might of the orators and martyrs whose essence, by long and repeated communion, he had absorbed into himself; from flight to flight he ascended, until with unflagging energy he towered straight upwards and dragged the rapt contemplation of his audience along with him in its ethereal flight. At such times, says the Abbé Le Dieu, it seemed as though the heavens were opened and celestial joys were about to descend upon these trembling souls, like tongues of fire on the day of Pentecost. At other times, heads bowed down with humiliation, or pale upturned faces and streaming eyes, lips parted with broken ejaculations of despair, silently testified that the spirit of repentance had breathed on many a hardened heart. 'M. Bossuet,' said Madame de Sévigné, 'se bat à outrance avec son auditoire: tous ses sermons sont des combats à mort.'

The sermons which now pass under the name of Bossuet are but ill calculated to give us an idea of the eloquence which moved the genius, the heroism, and the fashion of the Court of Louis XIV. Piles of illegible drafts, overcharged with Greek and Latin texts, have, by the diligence or guesswork of successive editors, been arranged in some sort of order.

But Bossuet himself had no care to appear in print; he considered the life of a priest should not be in words but in actions. The Abbé Vaillant, in one of his theological works, made a special study of the sermons of Bossuet, and succeeded with much labour in determining their dates and disentangling them one from the other; and with his aid Bossuet, like Raphael or Corregio, is to be studied in his first, second, and third manner.

Bourdaloue has been said to be the finest work of Bossuet. Undoubtedly the sermons of that great preacher, as well as those of Massillon, will ever be ranked amongst the first triumphs of pulpit oratory, but in the *oraison funèbre* Bossuet stands confessedly without a rival. Panegyric has doubtless to dread more than any other form of composition the criticism of posterity. Time—‘le grand justicier du passé,’ to use an expression of Montaigne’s—is terribly impartial, and crumbles ruthlessly to dust the bases of all statues raised on perishable foundations. Yet in our attempts to judge eulogistic orators we should place ourselves in the position of the orator and behold his audience, his subject, and his age from his own point of view. This is especially the case as respects Bossuet. His political and religious reverence for monarchy, the influence of the personality of Louis XIV.—that ‘*effrayante majesté*’ as even the *frondeur* St. Simon calls it,—his aversion to change, his unalterable faith in all the temporal and spiritual institutions then existing, his enthusiastic sense of the greatness and nothingness of human glory, the tremendous antithesis of his character—all serve to make, in these reforming and sceptical days, the ‘*Oraisons funèbres*’ difficult of appreciation, until the mind is content to admire the orator within the limits of his dogmas, like a lion bounding within the radius of his chain. To appreciate these discourses of Bossuet we must quit this generation of plain clothes and sober estimation of kings and princes, and call down from their frames those magnificent personages who glow upon the canvass of Rigaud and Vandermeulen, and fill with them the chapel of Versailles or the Louvre. We must place ourselves before that multitude of *seigneurs* in umbrageous perukes, of princesses and fine ladies *aux coiffures étagées*,—before that sea of gorgeous apparel of crimson, green, and purple, glittering in gold and lace, scintillating with ribbons, and stars, and diamonds,—and stand face to face with the cynosure of all eyes, the incarnate embodiment of the most ancient monarchy in Europe; before whom kings trembled, leagued, and knelt; while at home his power was adored like that of an idol, his authority revered like that of a master or a father,

and his favour courted like that of a mistress. But to Bossuet Louis XIV. was more than all this. The royal crown was surrounded with a reflex of Divine splendour. He was the favoured child of the Most High — the representative not only of the glories of Clovis and Charles Martel, but of Abraham and of David. From the tents of the patriarchs and from the palaces of Mount Zion was transmitted a halo of theocratic splendour, which rested on the head of the King of France.

To such an imagination a more moving subject could hardly be offered than the death of Henrietta, the wife of Charles I. While in her cradle her father fell under the dagger of Ravallac; in her youth her wit and grace were the theme of universal admiration, and inspired St. François de Sales with the happiest auguries; at sixteen she was married to the young prince of the House of Stuart, who now for the first time was the inheritor of three crowns. But alas for human foresight! the daughter, wife, and mother of kings knew almost every form of human misery, — the fury of revolt, the insults of the mob, the agitations of flight, the perils of tempestuous seas dared in vain, the enterprise of hope, the courage of despair, the agony of impotent resolve in the face of overpowering destiny, a husband's bloody end, the mournings of a royal widow insulted by the mad frenzy of the Fronde, her country a place of exile. This daughter of France had a true title to be called 'la reine 'malheureuse,' and to say that her misery was as boundless as her fortune.

'Be wise, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth,' was the text of Bossuet, which thrilled his auditors with a sort of religious terror, almost equal to that of the 'Dieu seul est grand, mes frères,' of Massillon. Taking advantage of the emotion excited by the text, the orator, in a most lofty exordium, at once unveils the awful reality of God the Lord of all empires, the chastiser of princes, reigning above the heavens, making and unmaking kingdoms, principalities, and powers, and declaring by terrible judgments that the mightiest pyramids of power afford no shelter from the breath of his anger. The same religious awe pervades the whole piece. It is the majestic stream of inspiration which gives motion to the rapid and powerful narrative, the sublime reflections, the magnificent imagery, the portraits worthy of Tacitus or Sallust, that are borne calmly on its surface. The fatal consequences of schism, the extravagance of fanaticism, the horrors of rebellion which devastated a country more agitated 'than the ocean that surrounds it,' necessarily pass before the review of Bossuet as he grapples with the elements of fury which consumed the dis-

tracted kingdom of Charles. After describing the perils of the Monarchy, beset on all sides by the saints of the Millennium, by Independents, Anabaptists, and Levellers, he draws that nameless and admirable portrait of the mighty genius who ruled the whirlwind and directed the storm. Huguenot and hero, politician and saint, doctor and soldier, prophet and captain, indefatigable in war and peace, with a prudence and activity which outsped, arrested, and awaited fortune, impenetrable in council, thrusting a nation into slavery with the standard of liberty,—Cromwell is conceived by Bossuet as one of those destined by inscrutable Providence to change the fate of empires. On the other side a queen struggling unconquerably against destiny and revolt, seeking unweariedly for new forces, crossing nine times the sea, serene and gay amid battle and shipwreck, animating the king's councils, wrestling foot by foot with defeat, alone amid the ruins of the state, unbending as a column which, long the sole support of a majestic temple in decay, receives at length the sinking mass of the vast edifice with unmoved constancy. To the triumph over the world succeeds the higher victory of faith; and the calm dignity of the conclusion of the oration resembles the peaceful end of the queen, who sought in the convent of Chaillot a refuge from the pitiless storm of life. Even now, that we know these imposing pictures of characters and events to be as untrue and unreal as if they belonged to the creations of the tragic drama, they excite a sympathy in the pages of Bossuet, which the judgment of History refuses to their follies and their crimes.

It was destined that a young princess, whose tears flowed plentifully over the coffin of the Queen of England, should herself be the subject of the next *oraison funèbre*. The youthful vivacity and graceful affability of the youngest daughter of Charles I. and Henrietta,—Madame Henriette Anne d'Angleterre, the wife of Philippe Duc d'Orleans, the only brother of Louis XIV.,—was the ornament and delight of the court of Versailles. To much natural sensibility she added a correct taste; and the encouragements she bestowed on genius were doubled by her charming condescension. She loved to talk with Racine or Corneille about the plot of 'Bérénice' or 'Nicomède'; and once, while walking in the galleries of Versailles, followed by a crowd of courtiers, she beckoned with a smile to Boileau, whispered in his ear one of the prettiest lines of the 'Lutrin,' and then tripped after the king and the royal family. 'On croyait,' said Bossuet, 'avoir atteint la perfection quand on avait plu à 'Madame.' She felt at once the ascendancy of Bossuet's genius, and placed herself under his spiritual guidance. The

secrets of political intrigue were also entrusted to her keeping; and it was on her return from the arrangement of the famous treaty of Dover with her brother Charles II., that she was seized with a mysterious illness, after drinking a glass of succory water, administered by the hateful minions of her own husband. Her agonies were appalling. She knew the touch of death, and cried impatiently for the end of her sufferings. She longed for Bossuet: she said she should be inconsolable if she died without hearing him, and demanded repeatedly if he were coming. On his arrival she felt the bitterness of death was over. The strong spirit of Bossuet himself was overcome for a moment to see the pale flag of death and anguish planted upon cheeks lately radiant with health and beauty. He knelt by her bedside; he shook off the shackles of earthly emotion. At the sound of his eloquent voice the features of Henrietta beamed with celestial hope: she besought him not to leave her stricken soul alone in the awful combat, but to deliver her unscathed into the arms of eternity. For four hours Bossuet continued, amid her weeping relatives and attendants, to utter words of faith and consolation, until at length, pressing with dying hand the crucifix to her lips, she welcomed the fatal moment with the same sweetness which had distinguished her life. One hour before death she spoke in English to her attendants—it was to tell them to give to Bossuet after death an emerald ring. Louis himself placed it on his finger, desired him always to wear it, and to preach her funeral sermon at St. Denis. Speaking under the influence of this tragic scene, no wonder if Bossuet, although he wanted the great topics of national commotions and a dethroned monarch, produced a discourse not inferior to the former one. The pathos of the second rivals the sublimity of the first. We seem still to hear, as we read the passage, that terrible cry which rang through the halls of Versailles—‘*Madame se meurt! Madame est morte!*’ and to see the audience sobbing with veiled faces as the words were pronounced, while the orator himself was unable to proceed from the violent outburst of sorrow.

From time to time as the bier was spread for some royal or noble form, the voice of Bossuet called France again to meditate on the awful themes of time, death, and eternity. His last effort was the well-known discourse over the great Condé, in which he breathes the ardent spirit of the dead hero, and unites the fire of an epic poet with the zeal of a prophet. Every schoolboy knows by heart the magnificent peroration which called on nations, princes, nobles, and warriors to come to the foot of the catafalque which strove to raise to heaven a mag-

nificent testimony of the nothingness of man. Bossuet's own white locks then warned him that his failing voice and declining energy would ere long be quenched in the same cold silence and decay which possessed for ever the great prince who loved to hold converse with him beneath the forest shades and around the unsleeping fountains of Chantilly.

It has been the custom to call Bossuet the Demosthenes of the pulpit. As Bossuet says of Alexander, that he partakes of the triumph of every conqueror, so we may say of Demosthenes, that he shares the glory of every orator. If by so calling him, no more is meant than that he is the greatest orator of the Romish Church, so much may be conceded; but we can discover little affinity between the boldest strokes of Athenian patriotism and the gorgeous exaltation of the 'Oraisons funèbres.' The Attic precision of the one is, in direct contrast with the Asiatic richness of the other, whose style is so coloured, that the finest abstractions of Christian philosophy grew visible at his touch. The best of the 'Oraisons funèbres' are not Demosthenic, but Pindaric. It is the inspiration of the lyric poet, united with the deep voice of the historian, that swells out in the noblest passages; and the poetry of France can hardly produce a page comparable to the diction of her greatest writer in prose.

With all this, there is no display of art: Bossuet's language, though grand, seems the natural speech of his fervid imagination, and it was peculiarly his own, though many phrases of his coinage have since become current among French writers. He has not the silvery cadence and polished phrase of Massillon; nor has he the argumentative strategy of Bourdaloue, which was so illustrative of the '*imperatoria virtus*' of Quintilian, that Condé cried out once, when the Jesuit mounted the pulpit, 'Silence, Messieurs, voici l'ennemi!' Yet there is only one production of the French pulpit which can be compared with his best efforts; and that is the really evangelic sermon of Fénelon on the Epiphany, where the vast love of the swan of Cambray is clothed in language so pure and holy, that it would have become the lips of the angels who sang on earth peace and goodwill to men.

The ability of Bossuet was without a rival. He was made a member of the Académie Française, and also Bishop of Condom. This bishopric, however, he ceded in order to undertake the education of the Dauphin, the duties of which employment kept him for many years at the court of Versailles. The King appears from the first to have understood that Bossuet was the prelate especially adapted to support that administrative unity in Church and State to which his imperious nature tended, and



that no more fitting preceptor could be found of the duties of a king as he himself conceived them. The Dauphin's earliest infancy had been placed under the care of the celebrated Mlle. de Rambouillet. This lady married M. de Montausier, a nobleman of high character and position; and he was appointed governor to the young prince, with Bossuet as preceptor. The scheme of education was magnificent. The learned Huet, Madame Dacier, and others prepared the well-known classics *ad usum Delphini*; the erudite Tillemont composed the 'Life of St. Louis,' the brilliant Flechier his 'Life of Theodosius,' for the especial use of the royal pupil. Bossuet conducted their labours; comprehending in his vast mind the whole range of ancient and modern literature and philosophy. He plunged anew into antiquity with all the ardour of youth. It is said he knew by heart nearly all the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey.' He never spoke of Homer without the epithet divine. His passion for him was so great, that he recited his verses in his sleep. On one occasion, when he astonished an episcopal colleague by thundering out a long passage, he said, 'What marvel! when after having been a teacher of grammar and rhetoric for so many years.' 'Where?' said the Bishop. 'At Versailles and St. Germain's.' He wrote criticisms on style in the manner of the classic poets and historians. He composed a fable in the iambics of Phædrus, which passed current as genuine.

A letter in classic Latinity was written by Bossuet to Innocent XI., in which he submitted for his approval the course of education proposed. Grammar, logic, rhetoric, history, politics, religion--all passed under the review of Bossuet, taught in a way worthy of himself. Piles of manuscript yet exist in his handwriting and in that of his pupil, which attest the industry of the prelate in these duties. He studied French history from the original documents, dictated to the Dauphin in French his observations on each epoch, and the pupil translated them into Latin: in this way they got as far as the reign of Charles IX.

The principal treatises which Bossuet composed for the education of the Dauphin are collected in his works, comprising philosophy, politics, and history; and it is in these that his peculiar theories of the relation of God and man, sovereign and subject, are most apparent.

The philosophical treatises written for the Dauphin were 'La Connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même,' and 'Le Traité du libre Arbitre.' It would require far more space than the limits of this article will allow to give a due estimate of Bossuet's importance as a philosopher. In his treatises, in his sermons, in his

controversies with Protestant, Molinist, and Idealist, he has handled every question of metaphysics; and his opponents had to cope not only with a consummate theologian, but with a profound philosopher, who had constructed for himself a system by the aid of reason alone, with no help from Theology or Revelation. His great mind, secure in its rooted and immoveable faith, saw the danger of setting philosophy at defiance in the name of Religion. To Religion and Philosophy he allotted their distinct domains. To expound the one was the office of the Church; to advance the other was the province of the philosopher. To the one he assigned as guides, authority and tradition; to the other, sense and free investigation were the very conditions of its existence. He professed himself as favourable to the progress of pure philosophy as he was opposed to all innovation in the dogmas of the ancient faith; and by the aid of his comprehensive genius, with the grasp of his vigorous reason, but above all by the perspicacity and clearness of his vision, the orthodoxy of the bishop never clashed with or embarrassed the system of the philosopher, and the conquests made by the unassisted efforts of the understanding were, when gained, sanctified to the uses of theology. Bossuet, it is true, invents nothing, he only expounds; but with admirable clearness and order he combines with a well-connected system the lessons he has learnt from his great masters. Indeed, there are few among all the great intellects who have dedicated their power to philosophy, who can lay claim to invention. The great truths of metaphysics are like family jewels, which descend as heirlooms from generation to generation, and are perpetually reset to suit the fashion of the times. It is the manner of presenting them, and not the substance which changes. The language of Bossuet is admirably adapted to philosophical subjects,—simple and strong, with a power of plain illustration which presents the most abstract ideas in the most concrete forms to the imagination. His principal masters are Descartes, St. Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas. At the college of Navarre he was nursed in the doctrine of the Angel of the Schools. To this mitigated Peripateticism he continued to adhere on many sovereign points of philosophy and theology, conciliating with it as far as possible the Platonism of St. Augustine and the new spiritual philosophy of Descartes, which he found making such progress among thinking minds. Descartes, it may be said, furnishes him with the main nerves of his philosophy. In ‘*La Connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même*,’ he is eminently Cartesian both in his treatment and matter. He rises, like Descartes, from the fact of the possession of eternal and immutable truths by the finite and imper-

fect intelligence to the collocation of these truths in the mind of an Eternal Being, and leans on the authority of Plato, 'ce divin philosophe,' and of St. Augustine. Like Descartes, too, he rises from the idea of the infinite and perfect to the existence of a cause of the idea adequate to the idea, and therefore infinite and perfect in itself. Indeed these notions, eternal and immutable,—the τὰ ὄντως ὄντων of Plato, which would subsist if every intelligence were destroyed, which have an objective existence independent of the sentient subject,—can reside in no subject except one, in which all truth is eternally subsisting and entirely comprehended. No senses could avail to convey to the imperfect and finite human intelligence the notion of an infinite and perfect being of God, if the truth were not present at all times to all spirits, inspiring them with light, life, and apprehension; and if the narrow and dark prison-house of sensual perception were not irradiated on all sides by the effulgence of celestial glory. But at the same time Bossuet carefully stops short of, and combats, the extravagance of Malebranche, which destroys the *alterity*—to use the word which he takes from Plotinus—of the human intelligence, and the divine truths on which it is nourished, which engulphs the human mind in its nothingness in the Divinity. These eternal truths are but entrusted to man for his guidance; they illuminate his thought, but still proceed from Heaven. Their rays descend into the soul, which, made in the image of God, is endowed with the capacity of reflecting them, and of comprehending as much of its Divine Original as it has been given it to comprehend. The Cartesian treatise of Bossuet is a complete physiological and psychological investigation of the nature of man, and his relation to God. In order to render himself fully conversant with the nature of the body, he dedicated some considerable time to the study of anatomy in the schools of medicine. The structure of the human frame, its functions and operations, are distinctly described and defined, as well as its points of contact with the soul; and although he professes not to reveal the secret by which the ever-existing miracle of the obedience of the body to the soul is determined, yet he points out clearly how merely corporeal movements and impressions are to be distinguished from intellectual sensations.

In the '*Traité du libre Arbitre*' the conclusions of Bossuet are not so satisfactory. He adopts, after examining the other systems, and particularly the *délectative victorieuse*, the *primitive* or *prédéterminative physique* of Thomas Aquinas: he thought this was the just mean between the Molinist who discredited grace, and the Calvinist who discredited free will. Between the two he found himself like St. Augustine between the Pelagians

and the Manichæans. Every fresh generation has gone to the grave, and left behind some testimony of the incompetence of the human mind to span the incalculable abyss. That man is or believes himself to be free, and yet depends on the will of God, is the mystery; and it is far better to leave it so than to darken the matter more by a more mysterious explanation, and then call in the name of God to silence argument.

In the treatise entitled '*La Politique sacrée tirée de la Saint Ecriture*' Bossuet fully developed his political theory, and aspired to be the apologist of despotism. The first part of this treatise only was composed for the Dauphin; and even up to the last hour of his life he was occupied in its completion. We have here the matured result of Bossuet's political speculations. Never, certainly, were such gigantic talents employed to give a divine sanction to the doctrine of passive obedience; and the treatise will ever remain a perpetual monument, that it may be possible for the highest genius to accept as the foundations of political and social power theories which the common sense of a school-boy would rightly reject with disdain. Bossuet is perhaps the most complete type of the pure Conservative which ever existed. He was born old; a zealot of the dogma he never doubted, change was to him hateful. For the future he had no hopes and no aspirations. He knew none of those yearnings for the amelioration of man's earthly lot which are often the anguish and the glory of the poets of progress—the Fénelons of politics. He dreamt of no Utopia or Salentum, for he wished for none,—or rather, a land of slaves and eremites, with a king the undisputed lord of all, was his Utopia. Immutability was his great test of all things. He was one of those imperious minds who, being strong themselves, sympathise with the strong; love the rapidity of force; think persuasion and compromise tedious; who, like M. de Maistre and Mr. Carlyle, adore power wherever established, and, see no justice in a defeated cause. 'On ne doit pas examiner comment est établie la puissance; c'est assez qu'on la trouve établie et régnant. Au caractère royal est inhérent une saintété qui ne peut être effacée par aucun crime, même chez les princes infidèles.' We see Bossuet hesitated not to follow his premisses to their extreme legitimate conclusions. *Deum time, honorificate regem*, is his whole doctrine. Louis XIV. could never have heard from Bossuet's lips anything not in perfect harmony with his own conceit of his royal dignity and necessity. Bossuet was the ideal subject, as Louis himself was the ideal king. Bossuet thus defines royalty:—'*La prince est un personnage public—tout l'état est en lui; la volonté de tout le peuple est renfermée dans*

'la sienne.' The words '*L'état, c'est moi*,' were but the application of this axiom. To a monarch thus placed on the giddy apex of unlimited dominion, immoveably raised on divine authority, unassailable by human cares or apprehensions, Bossuet enjoins the fear of God. This is his constitutional check: on this the people must rely for wise and good government, for moderation from a master amid the temptations of boundless and irresponsible power. 'Such is the polity which Bossuet founds upon the Scriptures, — the same arsenal which shortly before had supplied the Independents with arguments for a Republic and the decapitation of kings.

But while Bossuet held these extravagant notions of regal power, his was pre-eminently a healthy spirit; he would never have been one of those distorted and morbid minds who roar for coercion in the midst of liberty of thought and speech. In his sketch of the policy of Greece and Rome, he shows how fully his really noble mind could appreciate the glorious dignity which history confers on every citizen of a free state. Natures like Bossuet's tend to unity and a strong government, and in their respect for antiquity and love of precedent, they employ this tendency in maintaining the supremacy of whatever happens to be established. Indeed, Bossuet does not omit to lay down that 'whatever government is established is best. The monarchy of France, which had grown from such small beginnings, and had so marvellously succeeded, after ages of conflict and subtle policy, in bringing all ancient Gaul (to use an expression of Richelieu), under its undisputed authority, seemed to him especially favoured by Divine power.

In this spirit Bossuet composed for the Dauphin the great Discourse on Universal History, through which his influence has been greatest on posterity. He was the first to attempt to deduce a fixed law from the history of the world, — to judge by a single principle and at a single glance the work of civilisation and of mankind. From St. Augustine or from Paulus Orosius he may have gathered the hint which put him on the track of this great conception, but the vigour and originality of its execution are his own. Vico may have seized the idea in a more philosophical sense, Herder may have developed it, Hegel may have rendered it capable of indefinite development, but not the less is Bossuet the Copernicus of history, who alone first clearly saw that history revolves about an eternal axis, and that the apparent aberrations of the destiny of the world, the rise and fall of empires, may, like the complex motions of the planets, be resolved with the precision of truth when referred to the right centre. Writers following in the

wake of Voltaire have accused Bossuet of giving too much space to the Hebrew people, and of making Jerusalem as it were the metropolis of the world; but Bossuet was no Voltairian, and the limits assigned to the Hebrew people are scientifically consistent with his views of the purpose of the destiny of man. His object, as the philosopher of the Catholic Church, was to exhibit, amid the shock and confusion of races and collision,—amid a world, the seeming prey of havoc and chance—amid the unutterable uproar of throne hurled on throne, and empire upon empire,—the calm features of religion alone superior to change, the serene companion and helper of man since the commencement of the world.

To show the active influence of each nation upon the establishment of Christianity, some ages are necessarily compressed to a span, and some countries entirely neglected. It is with nations as with the battalions of armies in combat,—some bear the brunt of battle and win the attention of the historian, but many add in the rear an unseen support to the onward march. The stores acquired by modern erudition and ethnography were wanting in the days of Bossuet to enable him to determine the true position of many of the ancient nations. Hence some races of the East and of mediæval Europe are missing in his pages. But he displays the wisdom of Egypt, the might of Assyria, the valour of Persia, the intellect of Greece, and the ambition of Rome, all unwittingly conspiring to bring mankind in submission to the foot of the Cross. There is doubtless much room for criticism, even from Bossuet's own point of view, in the dimensions and proportions of the work. In the first part, the torrent of events rolls onward with such precipitation that the attention is bewildered with the rapidity with which the cloudy forms of states and empires are hurried along by the whirlwind of destiny. The power of condensation is indeed admirable, but the plan is as level as a geographical chart. There is no grouping, no heights and valleys to catch the eye, and no space left in the sacred nature of the recital for emotion, which is the life of history, or for moral or philosophic reflection, which stamps its truths on the mind. The proofs of religion were never set forth with a firmer hand or more glowing style than in the second part; but it is in the third that we learn most to admire the depth and penetration of Bossuet's genius. It is in vain that he attempts to insinuate the advantage of a '*sujétion légitime*,' his grand imagination is inflamed, in spite of himself, at the aspect of the patriot freedom of Greece and Rome; the Catholic doctor breathes the spirit of Pericles and of Cato, shows himself the

equal of Machiavelli in politic insight, and the worthy precursor of Montesquieu.

The result of this vast scheme of education was not happy. The Dauphin was naturally of an inert temperament; and it was said that Bossuet overpowered an unaspiring mind with the immensity of his energy and the vast weight of knowledge prematurely thrust upon it: at any rate, he was wholly wanting in that affectionate sympathy which enabled the tender Fénelon to become the beloved master and confidant of his pupil the Duc de Bourgogne, and to convert a boy of violent and intractable temperament into an amiable and accomplished prince, destined, alas! to be but the Marcellus of France.

During the education of the Dauphin, Bossuet had more delicate and less agreeable duties to perform towards the King. The gentle La Vallière and the superb Montespan, when the royal caprice was over, were alike persuaded into retirement by the exhortations of Bossuet. The former, the penitent Magdalen,—‘la petite violette, qui se cachait sous l’herbe,’ to use the words of Madame de Sévigné, ‘et qui était honteuse d’être mère, d’être duchesse,’—longed to bury in the peace of the cloister the keen sufferings of a wounded heart; but the retirement of Madame Montespan was an affair of greater difficulty. The King himself had waverings, which induced her to think her empire was not ended. When the final vows of La Vallière were taken, the Queen presented the mortuary veil and Bossuet pronounced the discourse; and as he uttered the final adieux for the penitent victim, the audience sobbed aloud with pity for the late favourite, whom they heard consigned, under the name of the Sœur Louise de la Miséricorde, to the fearful rigour and living death of the Carmelites,—to serge and sackcloth, to midnight vigils, maceration, and servile duties, while the royal adulterer was parading a new *liaison* with a prouder paramour.

The life of Bossuet at the court was worthy of a great ecclesiastic. His equipage and establishment were modest; his society was composed of a select body of priests, men of letters, and judges. He was often to be seen, followed by an imposing *cortège*, discussing points of doctrine, philosophy, or history, pacing the alleys of Versailles, reminding observers of the plane trees of the Attic Academus. One alley was called the *Allée des Philosophes*. The idle saunterers of the gardens would often notice him within the *Bosquet d’Æsope*, discoursing on ecclesiastical history, with the Abbé Fleury taking notes by his side.

When the education of the Dauphin was concluded, Bossuet

was made Bishop of Meaux. Shortly after was convened the celebrated Assembly of 1682. Bossuet was called at once to be president; an office in which he rendered good service to his country, by mediating between the ungenerous arrogance of the King and the pretensions of the Holy See, and by reducing to a formulary the liberties of the Gallican Church.

The relation of France to Rome had long been unfilial, if not unfriendly. In 1663 the French troops passed the Alps, and were in readiness to march on Rome to avenge an affront offered to the Duc de Crequi, the French ambassador, when Cardinal Chigi, a brother of the Pope, was sent to Versailles to solicit pardon. It was the first time in the history of Europe that the Papal Court had known such humiliation since the brutal assault at Anagni. The Parliament and the Sorbonne seized the opportunity of fulminating on behalf of the Church of France. The King continued to make war on the ecclesiastical authority, until an attempt to extend the right of receiving the temporalities of a vacant see, and appointing to its benefices, — a right known by the name of the *régale*, — brought the contest of Royalty and Papacy to an issue.

Innocent XI. was not an unworthy adversary of Louis XIV. He was of the House of Odescalchi of Como, and entered Rome as a young soldier, with a sword by his side and pistols in his belt. His merit and zeal became so notorious, after he entered the Church, that the people of Rome clamoured for his elevation under the porticoes of St. Peter's, at the same time that the cardinals selected him in conclave. He had retained the vigour of the soldier under the priestly robe; his character was mild, firm, and conscientious; his private life unimpeachable; and, as Pope, impartiality and constant efforts to rectify abuses marked all his proceedings. To this pope appealed the two Jansenist bishops of Aleth and of Pamiers, who had opposed the extension of the *régale* over these sees, and had suffered such oppression at the hands of the King's officers, that the Bishop of Pamiers had been reduced to live on alms. Sentences of proscription, exile, and death were scattered among the clergy supporting the bishops. Innocent XI. responded to the appeal; twice, thrice, without result, did he address the King in terms of authority and menace, until, at last, he sent a brief to the chapter of Pamiers which violated all the maxims of the national church. The Parliament was not slow to enter in the quarrel, with all the violence of old times. The addresses of the clergy were redolent of the most abject adulation and servility; the Archbishop of Paris was, as Bossuet said



himself, ready, in true valet style, to follow every shift of the King's humour. Condé said, if the King took a fancy to turn Protestant, the clergy would be the first to follow. A popular song added that they would sign the Koran itself within a year if required. We are informed by the Abbé Le Dieu, that it was Colbert who saw the advantage to be gained from the present embroilment, and who determined the King to call an Assembly, for the purpose of defining clearly the relation of the Pope to Royalty and the Gallican Church.

The sermon which Bossuet preached at the meeting of the Assembly, is one of the finest monuments of his genius, and contains all the grounds of the doctrines afterwards comprised in the Declaration of the French prelates. Bossuet's conduct on this occasion was extremely skilful. He viewed with apprehension the convocation of an Assembly in the then excited state of opinion; he feared the spirit of subservience of great dignitaries of the Church; he feared the personal pique felt by many of the bishops towards the Court of Rome; and he equally feared the blind advocates of papal supremacy; nevertheless, under his guidance, the Gallican Church equally avoided schism and ultramontanism. The four articles of the Declaration were drawn up by him; the first three establish the independence of the temporal power, the superiority of Councils over the Pope, and the inviolability of the usages of the national church; the last declares that even in matters of faith, the decision of the Pope was always reformable by that of the Church. These are the principles on which rest the liberties of the Gallican Church, —liberties to which the clergy once clung with steadfast affection, and for establishing which the name of Bossuet was once held in honour. But the chicanery of Bellarmin and Rocaberti, and the still more recent violence of Bonald and De Maistre, have not been in vain exerted against doctrines asserted by an assembly of Catholic divines, headed by one of the greatest prelates the Church of Rome ever possessed. And it has been reserved to us in our own time to see the immortal principles of Bossuet repudiated by the majority of the French clergy, of whom Cardinal Beausset now is a fair representative, and the distinctive propositions of the Gallican Church become almost as obsolete in France as the distinctive propositions of Jansenism.

Bossuet had now reached his fifty-fifth year: his reputation was acknowledged in every part of Europe as one of the chiefest of the time; he had done sufficient to gain immortality, high position, respect, and troops of friends: all that men usually care for he possessed in abundance; but he felt, like Arnaud, that

he had eternity to rest in, and that the night was coming in which no man could work. His latter days have in them something heroic. The last twenty-two years of his life were one combat. He had thought to have placed the throne and the altar on imperishable foundations, and to have taught the human mind to flow around them, to rest in their shadow and reflect their glory; but alas, from every quarter under heaven came sweeping clouds of evil spirits laden with doctrines more pernicious than pestilence or famine. The lonely prelate stood ever on the defence, grappling on every side with his deadly assailants. If midnight vigils, meditations, long fastings, and fervent prayer can avail, he alone will deliver the human soul—left, like Andromeda, forlorn and helpless amid the monsters of the deep. In the church and out of the church, *le charme trompeur de la nouveauté*, a new source of anguish, meets him wherever he looks. Lutherans, Calvinists, and Arminians were recognised and respectable antagonists; but what were these compared with the new race of *esprits libertins*—deists, pantheists, sceptics—disciplined in the philosophy of Descartes and Malebranche, Spinoza, and Leibnitz, who now came rushing to the attack? Almost the only peace which Bossuet knew was in his frequent journeys to La Trappe: the lonely walks amid the horrid shades and round the sombre lake of that austere solitude, in the company of De Rancé; the lugubrious rites; the ever open and newly dug grave; the habitual admonition—*Frère, il faut mourir*—gave the weary prelate a foretaste of the quiet of the tomb. Only an iron constitution could have enabled him to accomplish such incessant labours. After he became Bishop of Meaux, he ever lay with a lamp by his bedside; his first sleep was usually four hours, after which, even in the severest winter, he arose, put on two dressing gowns, and placing a bear-skin wrapper over his legs, recited matins and lauds amid the stillness of the night; he then went to study his dockets of papers; his portfolios, his pen, paper, and inkstand were in readiness on his desk; his easy-chair placed in front, his books of reference on other chairs on each side. He studied until overcome with fatigue, after which he went again to bed. His domestic affairs were usually in considerable disorder; he paid little or no attention to them: his gardener regretted that his apple-trees were not the apple-trees of St. Ambrose or St. Jerome, as his master might then be induced to take notice of them. He left the management of his property to an intendant, and died in debt. He knew his deficiency, and excused it thus in a letter to the Maréchal Bellefond:—‘*Je perdrais plus de la moitié de mon esprit si j’étais étroit dans mon domestique.*’ Nevertheless, he

surprised his servants and friends sometimes by spontaneous acts of kindness which showed that his love of books and controversy had not altogether supplanted his love of men.

Protestantism still continued the main object of Bossuet's assaults. The great doctors on either side carried on with the pen that contest which the Guises and Colignys had been unable to settle with the sword. Of the voluminous results of Bossuet's labours in this cause, the two most celebrated treatises are the '*Exposition de la Foi Catholique*,' a *resumé* of the Romish doctrine to which Turenne attributed his conversion, which received the approval of the Church, and thousands of copies of which were printed at the King's expense for distribution; and the '*Variations des Eglises Protestantes*,' which subdued for a while the sceptical soul of Gibbon. Both these works bear the impress of his fervid impulse and vigorous understanding; but very different is the method which Bossuet adopts in these two treatises. The former is a simple exposition of the truths in which all Roman Catholics agree,—giving a plain statement of all such tenets as Catholics must believe,—leaving out all matters on which different opinions might exist, and cutting away all rites and practices introduced to conciliate the superstitious imaginations of the southern nations. But the manner of his argument changes completely when he plants his attack on the Protestant Churches, on the discrepancies of the Confessions of Faith, not on those points in which they agree. Had he drawn up an '*Exposition de la Foi Protestante*,' leaving out their disputes on controverted topics, he would have found they all concurred in rejecting the gross usurpations of the Romish Church, and received with himself the fundamental tenets of Christianity.

Paul Ferri, Bastide, Jurieu, Burnet, and the learned Basnage were the principal antagonists of Bossuet in his long controversy against the Protestants. Of these Jurieu carried on the war with the greatest pertinacity; and although from his absence of taste and asperity of language, Bossuet has all the advantage as far as manner goes, yet the replies of Jurieu undermined the very foundations of Bossuet's magnificent edifice. He denies that variation is a sign of the absence of truth; and against the divine right of kings he brought forward—ominous sound—the sovereignty of the people. Later in life, Bossuet was engaged in correspondence with a mind of giant mould, which carried into every department of physical, intellectual, and political science the same searching insight and boundless originality—the great Leibnitz. A project had been set on foot for the reconciliation of the Lutheran Church with

that of Rome. Bossuet was prepared to make great concessions; to allow communion under both forms, the use of the vulgar tongue; to submit even to the Lutheran bishops retaining their wives, and the abolition of the superstitious use of the worship of images. But the negotiation, though kept on foot for many years, was at last broken off: it was impossible to overcome the obstacle presented by the acts of the Council of Trent.

It had been well for Bossuet had he been content that Protestantism should be assailed alone by the aid of reason. A dark suspicion has attached to his name that he was a member of the council in which was decided the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. However this may be, he cannot be absolved from a heavy responsibility in the cruel persecutions which raged against the Protestants, when the influence of the great patriarch of the Gallican Church was at its height. To an imperious master he had preached the dogma of divine right and of non-resistance; and now, by maintaining the right of using violence on behalf of religion, he hardened an arrogant monarch in that barbarous policy which made France the theatre of the last religious persecution in Europe. It is true Bossuet himself was courteous in argument, and mild in treatment of the Protestants of his diocese; but all this is as nothing when weighed against the support which his character, genius, and position gave to the inflated pride and intolerance of Louis in those fatal counsels which began to prevail when Colbert ceased to have influence in the Cabinet, and the cold and wary Maintenon, the ferocious Louvois, the bigot Letellier, and the Jesuit La Chaise, met with no opposition. Where was the sonorous voice, the sounding phrase, and the pomp of declamation when, as St. Simon tells us, good Catholics groaned from the bottom of their hearts that a Christian monarch should, against the Huguenots, rival the atrocities of Pagan tyrants against the early Christians,—when the King's missionaries, in red coat and short carbine, were spurring from province to province to carry on the good work of conversion, and while villages were left deserted at the whisper of the approach of these booted apostles of murder and violence,—when the refinements of torture of the worst ages of barbarism were repeated at the command of the King's council, and the exhortations of a zealous priesthood were directed against all who persisted in not accepting His Majesty's religion?\* Their houses were plundered, their bodies racked,

---

\* 'Sa Majesté veut qu'on fasse sentir les dernières rigueurs à ceux qui ne voudront pas se faire de sa religion.' (*Letter of Louvois. Hist. de l'Edit de Nantes*, vol. v. p. 869.)

their feet roasted; they were strung up by the toes; they were shut up in deep damp cells with rotten carrion; their wives and daughters shrieked helplessly amid brutality and license; the apostacy of the child was paid for by the heritage of the father, and it was found the good work of conversion proceeded with astonishing rapidity. Thousands were tortured, abjured, and excommunicated in a single day. The hearts of a million and a half of Frenchmen sickened with despair. They took to flight; and the kingdom was drained of its very best citizens. The terrors of the sword and carbine, the galleys and the gibbet, were insufficient to stop the *déserteurs*, who preferred trusting themselves in their frail boats to the wintry fury of the Atlantic, and to the untrodden passes of the Alps, than to the tender mercies of Louis.

‘Prêchons ce miracle de nos jours, épanchons nos cœurs sur la piété de Louis, poussons jusqu’au ciel nos acclamations, et disons à ce nouveau Constantin, à ce nouveau Théodose, à ce nouveau Marcien, à ce nouveau Charlemagne, Vous avez affermi la foi, vous avez exterminé les hérétiques; c’est le digne ouvrage de votre règne, c’en est le propre caractère. Par vous l’hérésie n’est plus. Dieu seul a pu faire cette merveille.’

Such is the extravagant rhapsody of Bossuet about a measure which equalled in cruelty that of the expulsion of the Moors from Spain. The furies of civil butchery, rapine, and license were let loose; terror went before them, desolation behind; and the most eloquent voice of the Gallican Church swelled with rapturous emotion, while the blood of the just and the sufferings of a flying and persecuted people were crying vengeance throughout the length and breadth of France.

Against the Protestants, Bossuet could combat without compunction as against declared foes, but in Mysticism he found his most perilous and painful controversy, — a controversy in which he had first to pass the sword through the dearest affection of his heart, and in which, though he at last triumphed, his victory cost him dear: it cost him the gathered sympathies of long years of intercourse, the love of one who had adored him as a disciple, and whom he could now reverence as an equal. In the celebrated dispute with the Quietists there can be no doubt that Bossuet was right in the main; although we should have approved him more, had he carried less rancour into the discussion. The imperious and susceptible pride of the dogmatist, and the stifling effect of controversy on all human affection, are proverbial; but, besides this, we suspect that Bossuet must have looked with some jealousy on Fénélon’s growing interest at court; that he mistrusted the influence of

that tender nature, the magnetic attraction of a heart which was a shrine of love, benevolence, and charity,—the fascinating and philanthropic nature of one who united the graces and virtues of a nobleman, a Christian, and a saint. The Duc de Bourgogne, the heir to the crown, lived and breathed for Fénelon his preceptor, who had poured into the pupil's soul his own virtue, his own sanctity, and his own vast hopes for the future of man. Bossuet feared the progress of Fénelon's liberal opinions, the accomplishment of those vast projects he nourished for social amelioration, so entirely at variance with 'La Politique tirée de la Sainte Écriture.' The King himself heard of Fénelon's reforming schemes, and desired an explanatory interview, from which he retired, saying, that the prelate was '*le plus bel esprit et le plus chimérique de mon royaume.*' But a snare for Fénelon was spread in his own boundless love and enthusiastic imagination. The relations of St. François de Sales and Madame de Chantal are an instance of that mystic sympathy of aspiration towards the Infinite, in which it is hard to discover how much of human there was in that love which knew no earthly alloy. Madame Guyon was another Madame de Chantal, whose angelic features, inspired air, and piety gave her the air of an evangelic sybil; her hearers were fascinated with her doctrines of Pure Love, which, as recognisable in the 'Cantique des Cantiques,' and in 'Les Torrents,' are the same as were condemned by the Inquisition in Molinos. To these enthusiastic minds it seemed as if Heaven could be realised on earth, and the soul, by ecstatic volition, could lift itself at once to celestial glory and eternal peace.

To those possessed of this pious energy, all practice and discipline were indifferent: hence the name of *Quiétisme*. The soul possessed God, was at rest with him, and so incapable of sin. Madame de Maintenon saw, and was enraptured with the new Theresa. She introduced her to the little circle of which Fénelon was the spiritual chief. Fénelon granted her an interview: to use the words of the caustic St. Simon, '*leur sublime s'amalgama.*' A new and strange language began to be spoken by the *petit troupeau*, as the Duke calls them. The public generally were bewildered, and repeated the *mot* of Madame de Sévigné—'*Epaississez-moi la religion qui s'évapore en se subtilisant.*' The King, whom Madame de Maintenon attempted to indoctrinate, declared he was not sufficiently advanced to taste such *réveries*. Madame de Maintenon herself was disposed to think these new rhapsodies were not suited for the vulgar, and should be kept for the enjoyment only of the

initiated. Bossuet at last denounced Madame Guyon and her doctrines to the King; the prophetess was immured in Vincennes, and Bossuet demanded from Fénélon, as archbishop, a condemnation of Madame Guyon's opinions. Fénélon refused. The two prelates published their treatises. Bossuet's admirably written work was the '*Instruction sur les États d'Oraison.*' That of Fénélon was called '*Les Maximes des Saints,*' in which he justified, by quotations from the Fathers and Saints, so much of Madame Guyon's mysticism as he held. Bossuet declared the book heretical, and thenceforward carried on an implacable war against Fénélon.

On abstract principles there is little doubt that Bossuet and Fénélon were agreed; it was only in the *application* of them that they differed. Bossuet's condemnation fell upon the attempt to make use of the most spiritually gifted enthusiasts of the Church as ordinary guides for the conscience, and to combine their ecstatic ejaculations, in their most exalted fits of divine frenzy, with the sayings of obscure and ignorant fanatics, into a system of *religiosity* which would evidently be a most dangerous snare for the general mass of mankind. What was permissible for a Theresa, a François de Sales, or a Fénélon, was not so for all the world. The main difference between Bossuet and Fénélon was that Fénélon looked at principles alone, while Bossuet saw at once the principles and their most remote consequences. His excellent book, the '*Instruction sur les États d'Oraison,*' is full of admirable philosophy, and vindicates, in the clearest manner, the rights of human reason against the absurd aggressions of the mystics. Bossuet, with that good sense and practical spirit which, so pre-eminently distinguished him, had observed human nature carefully; he had studied himself; and in the confessional he had possessed full opportunity of studying, probing, and testing the limits of the conscience generally. Bossuet, the great controversialist, the antagonist of Calvin, Grotius, Malebranche, Simon, and Jurieu, the correspondent of Leibnitz, the head of the Gallican Church, the soul of its councils, found ample time to solve the difficulties of the most simple penitent, as may be seen in his correspondence with Madame Cornuau and other religious persons. He knew enough of human nature to see the danger of favouring in any way the progress of a mysticism which annihilated self, treated with contempt the humble assistance of reason (that secret inspiration of truth, as Bossuet terms it), and in despair, and despite of human intelligence, dreamed of nothing less than direct communion with God through a spiritual medium refined of all earthly and sensual alloy, in a

state of disembodied prayer, in which words were only a corporeal bar between thought and Omnipotence.

By the pure and elevated piety of Fénelon these consequences were overlooked, and he attached himself with immense ardour to the doctrine of Pure Love. Mysticism of this nature is the more dangerous, as it seizes the finest natures on their most disinterested and poetic side. The Archbishop of Cambrai appealed from the Council of the Gallican Church to Rome. The dispute lasted several years. All Europe was anxious to know how would terminate the great *procès* between the eagle of Meaux and the swan of Cambrai. The Pope and the cardinal inclined in favour of Fénelon. The Cardinal de Bouillon used every effort in his behalf, but Bossuet had Louis XIV. on his side, and both were determined that Fénelon should be convicted of heresy. Bossuet spoke in a contemptuous way of the *peu de lumière* possessed by the head of his church. A fulminating *mémoire* was drawn up by the prelate in the name of the King to quicken the Pope's judgment. The King, it was said, would know what to do if the matter were delayed longer. A plainer threat of schism and a national council could hardly be conveyed. At length the Vatican yielded. But the Pope, in pronouncing sentence, declared that if Fénelon had sinned from excess of love for God, Bossuet had sinned in the defect of love for his neighbour. Fénelon received judgment with unresisting meekness; he read his own condemnation from the pulpit, and never uttered a complaint. He spent years of exile in his diocese, deserted by all who longed for favour at the court. The King feared him. The memorable remonstrance of Fénelon, and his known opinions, were unpardonable offences. Madame de Maintenon hated him, for she had injured and deserted his cause. A brief gleam of sunshine came just before his beloved pupil was snatched away; but Fénelon bowed his head to the stroke; he sought refuge in his sublime patience and his boundless charity. He died like a saint and a poet. His memory survives his works, for his name is engraven on the heart of France, and the savour of his virtues is still sweet in the memories of his countrymen.

The two prelates were never reconciled. The very humility of Fénelon angered Bossuet more; and he seems to have carried his rancour to the grave. In this journal we find him stating that Fénelon had acted the perfect hypocrite all his life. He was too imperious to brook difference of opinion, even in his friend and pupil; *ce cher disciple*, as he said, *que j'ai porté dans mes*



'entrailles.'\* It is strange, indeed, that two such sublime types of two such opposite characters should be shown to France at the same time. Bossuet was born with all the vigour and fixity of age,—Fénélon retained till death all the generous glow and boundless elasticity of youth. Bossuet preached the doctrine of fear,—Fénélon that of love. Bossuet's mind was petrified by ever looking back,—that of Fénélon was directed ever forward, in spite of the taunts and despair of sceptics and unbelievers. The one loved immutability, the other progress. In the heart of the one ruled mistrust, in that of the other confidence. Bossuet was a Conservative, Fénélon a Liberal. The genius of the former was Hebrew and Roman, that of the latter Grecian and Evangelical. The one had the stern majesty of a prophet by Michael Angelo, the other the ecstatic beauty of a martyr by Guido Reni. Bossuet's last days were sad,—he suffered severe pain from an illness which had been growing upon him for years. But though the body broke, the spirit was unconquerable. He looked around, it is true, with gloomy forebodings. He viewed with terror the sceptical spirit of Montaigne revived in Pierre Bayle; and saw the future pregnant with evil. He said sadly, 'Je prévois que les esprits forts pourront être décrédités, non pour aucune horreur de leurs sentiments, mais parcequ'on tiendra tout dans l'indifférence hors les plaisirs et les affaires.' He foresaw, in fact, *l'indifférence en matière de religion*. Still he plied his pen unweariedly: convinced that he was placed by Providence in the breach against the assaults of pernicious doctrine, he remained there till the last. Protestant, Socinian, Jansenist, and Jesuit controversies still absorbed his main efforts. In his very last hours he was still working at his 'Politique,' at his 'Elévations sur les Mystères,' and 'Méditations sur l'Evangile,' in which religion speaks with a voice of awe and mystery, and philosophy is borne aloft by the spirit of theology to the highest regions of transcendental metaphysics; while the eyes of the soul reveal to us as much of the excess of light as it is possible perhaps for human imagination to conceive.

---

\* Letter of Fénélon to Bossuet:—'Nous sommes vous et moi l'objet de la dérision des impies; nous faisons gémir les gens de bien. Que tous les autres hommes soient hommes c'est ce qui ne doit pas surprendre, mais que des ministres de Jésus Christ,—ces anges des églises,—donnent au monde profane et incrédule de tels spectacles, c'est ce qui demande des larmes de sang: Trop heureux si au lieu de ces guerres de doctrines nous avons toujours fait nos catéchismes dans nos diocèses, pour apprendre nos pauvres villageois à connaître et à aimer notre Dieu.'

From the journal of the Abbé Le Dieu we gather much interesting information concerning the latter days of the aged prelate. True to his announcement in the peroration of his discourse on Condé, he consecrated himself to the duties of his diocese; he laid aside the dignity and diction of the great Churchman, and preached to humble townsfolk and villagers, in terms of paternal affection and simplicity, the same doctrines which he had laboured to enforce on the splendid congregations of Versailles and the Louvre. We find him catechising children, visiting the sick, teaching and aiding the poor to bear the ills of life with patience, administering confirmation, assisting at conferences of the clergy, directing the hospitals, and reforming the monasteries. Nevertheless, his fatal disease, the stone, was growing fast upon him: he endeavoured to hide it as long as he could, but the excruciating pains he suffered made it too soon apparent. The journey from Paris to Meaux and Versailles became more than he could bear; he sought in vain for relief in carriages with easy springs, and even in litters. The King's physicians were called in, but they could do little, and the mention of an operation at his advanced age threw him into a feverish state of consternation. He found little consolation from the court he had edified, or from the nephews and nieces who flourished on his bounty. One fixed idea swayed his later years, — which was that his nephew should be appointed his successor in the bishopric. The nephew was certainly not a fit character to fill the office, — he was intriguing, worldly, selfish, and indelicate; but a worse man was appointed: a refusal highly mortifying to a dignitary of Bossuet's merit. But Bossuet in his own person had not met with too much favour at court: many a prelate of high lineage stepped before him there. All chance of becoming a cardinal directly through Rome was lost for him by his part in the declaration of 1682. The nomination of his nephew, however, was his favourite project: he presented a *mémoire* to the King on the subject with his own hand, and the King replied nothing, but that the matter required great reflection. He courted the favour of Madame de Maintenon on every occasion which he could invent for writing to her. If a short answer of eight lines came, the dying prelate treasures it fondly, shows it to everybody, and receives it back, 'avec un grand empressement.' 'Grand régal 'ce soir au logis où on attendait M. l'Abbé Bossuet,' writes the Abbé Le Dieu, on one such occasion. Madame de Maintenon, however, at last lost all patience. Bossuet came in September, 1703, to Versailles, to look, as usual, after his nephew's interest. Madame de Maintenon had the following message conveyed to

him, as sufficient a proof of the cold-heartedness of that prudent lady, as could well be given.

‘ M. Dodart trouvant M. l’Abbé Fleury lui a dit que M. de Meaux devait s’en aller à Paris, et même à Meaux ; que Me. de Maintenon lui a dit qu’elle était *étonnée* de ce qu’il n’était pas encore parti de Versailles, *s’il voulait donc mourir à la Cour !* M. Dodart ajouta que M. de Meaux *n’a besoin ni de chirurgien ni de médecin* ; qu’il n’y aucune opération à faire à son mal ; qu’il lui suffit de voir un médecin une fois en huit jours pour ordonner son régime ; qu’il n’en a pas besoin d’ailleurs.’

He went accordingly to Paris, where it is painful to read that when he was in such a state of agony that his cries and groans made all tremble about him—when he was carried from his bed to his chair like an inanimate man—when he was dragged about the room for exercise by two footmen—when all he could take for nourishment was a few drops of wine, or the wing of a chicken—when his cheeks were sunken and his body wasted to a skeleton,—one servile topic still occupied his thoughts:—‘ as soon as ever he was able to get out, he goes to promenade in the Tuileries, and endeavours,’ says the Abbé Le Dieu, ‘ to go up and down the slopes, in order to see if his strength was equal to the staircase of Versailles and one more solicitation.’

But though his body was racked with sufferings, and he had not renounced the objects of clerical ambition, he still continued his old avocations as long as he could. Grotius, Tillemont, and Fleury were his lightest reading. He made emendations on his own works as the Abbé Le Dieu read them, and, like Swift, broke out in admiration of his early prowess. But the end was near. He cried out continually, ‘ *Fiat voluntas tua ! adveniat regnum tuum !*’ also, ‘ *Domine, vim patior ; sed non confundar, scio enim cui credidi ;*’ and on another occasion, at the mention of his glory, ‘ *Cessez vos discours et demandez pardon à Dieu de mes péchés.*’ He died on the 12th of April, 1704, at the age of seventy-seven. Voltaire was then ten years old.

During his illness his nephews, the Abbé and another, had been providing for the worst. The Abbé laid hands on the plate, and got possession of that. The other endeavoured to have his revenge with the manuscripts, but the Abbé had forestalled him there likewise. The Abbé’s constitution was weak, and he indulged in good cheer on fast days, which much scandalised the good Le Dieu ; and Madame Bossuet, the niece, gave a large supper in Lent, the din of which destroyed the dying bishop’s repose. The Abbé sends his servants off to the opera before Bossuet’s face ; Madame Bossuet goes likewise

with her daughters, leaving Bossuet alone in the house—all knowing that Bossuet had written against theatrical amusements, and thought them unchristian spectacles. Madame Bossuet after a masquerade gets up at midday to hear mass, and then goes to bed again. ‘*Quelle vie,*’ cries the Abbé Le Dieu, ‘in the house of our prelate!’ Such was the life of the nearest relatives of a bishop whose decease was expected daily, at an epoch which its apologists laud for the perfect fulfilment of social duties.

So Bossuet breathed his last, but not at the court. The King and Madame de Maintenon were not offended! No dead prelate defiled the precincts of Versailles. The courtiers were much moved. There was a great deal to be given away. The old lion was dead, who shall have his skin? The death happened at a quarter-past four in the morning. The Abbé Bossuet was informed. No time was to be lost. He dressed himself, went straight off to Marly, and was presented to the King. The King was grieved; and gave him, not the bishopric but the rich abbey which Bossuet held; and he went back to his dead uncle ‘*plein de joie et témoignant une grande satisfaction.*’ Bossuet’s charge of *premier aumônier* and that of *conseiller d’état* were given away likewise on the spot. The destination of the bishopric kept people in suspense some time. The court was represented at the obsequies by the groom of the Dauphin, who was not even *gentilhomme*. The higher order of the clergy were scarce, but the inferior were abundant. The people of Meaux, however, made amends: they came out in an immense crowd to meet the procession as it approached; and the simple folk were heard to repeat to each other, ‘*C’est grand dommage qu’un si grand homme soit mort; il a bien parlé et bien travaillé toute sa vie pour la défense de la foi,*’—a eulogy which the late prelate would doubtless have preferred to the pompous orations pronounced over him at Rome, Paris, and elsewhere. The worst feature of the whole was, that when the will of Bossuet was read, there was no mention of the poor, nor of his old servants—not even of the Abbé Le Dieu, who had served him for twenty years, nor of his church, except to desire that his body might be placed there. The Abbé his nephew, who was named *légataire universel*, in order to hide the deficiency of the will, offered an ornament to the chapter, which was accepted with much satisfaction, and no further remark made about the will.

But enough of these details, which present a cynical contrast to the illustrious man for whose sake they are remembered.

Posterity demands of a great genius, be he orator or theologian, king, conqueror, or statesman, what use he has made of his

talents for the benefit of mankind. Intellectual triumphs, like martial victories, may undoubtedly be more dazzling than useful. When we bring Bossuet to this test our judgment must be severe. Tried as a literary artist, who produced the finest models of the sublime and pathetic in French literature; who enriched his native tongue with many noble forms of expression; who invented, in fact, a grand language; his influence has been great, and all the homage that great intellects could render to his merit has been given him alike by friend and foe: but the homage of the intellect is poor indeed, when compared with the homage of the heart; that nameless yearning which is felt towards the real guides and benefactors of man amid the perplexities of his earthly career, which overleaps time and space, and grows broader and deeper as it falls from generation to generation. Bossuet himself, with his superb contempt of mere literary display, would, if his great shade were to appear among us, refuse to be judged as a mere artist; he would demand to stand or fall by his worth as a theologian, a moralist, a prelate, a politician, and a citizen.

As a bishop we search in vain for evidence that he attempted to use his high position and authority to moderate the vain love of ostentation, the ruinous love of war and glory which rendered his master the disturber of the peace of Europe and the devastator of France, by impoverishing her cities and her plains, and starving her people. We search in vain for the manly and Christian warnings of the remonstrance of Fénelon\*, or the severe lesson given to kings and nobles by Massillon in 'Le petit Carême.'

It cannot be said he stood erect, in the face of abused power, a mediator between the angry voice of the people and the purple tyranny of kings. It cannot be said,—

'Illum non populi fascies nec purpura regum  
Flexit.'

On the contrary, he possessed a large share of the courtier spirit. He was accused of it by others, and in part confessed it himself. On one occasion, Madame de Maintenon called him the dupe of the Court; and on another he said to the superiors of a convent, on quitting them, 'Daughters, pray for me.' 'What

---

\* 'Le peuple même (il faut tout dire) qui vous a tant aimé, qui a eu tant de confiance en vous, commence à perdre l'amitié, la confiance, et même le respect. Vos conquêtes et vos victoires ne le rejouissent plus; il est plein d'aigreur et de désespoir. La sédition s'allume peu à peu de toutes parts. Ils croient que vous n'avez aucune pitié de leurs maux, que vous n'aimez que votre autorité et votre gloire.'  
(*Letter of Fénelon to Louis XIV.*)

‘shall we pray for?’ ‘*Que je n’aie pas tant de complaisance pour le monde.*’ Yes, Bossuet had more complaisance for the foibles and follies of the great, their ruinous extravagances and intolerant pride, than for the importunate voice of noble aspirations, and the despairing cry of the lowly and just whose rights were trampled on and privileges annihilated. As a politician and a citizen his influence was pernicious, and was deeply felt in the succeeding age; and the haughty disdain which he professed for political speculation, the marvellous subservience of so great a spirit to the principles of unlimited obedience, the authority of his great example, deterred his countrymen from forming habits of political thought, served to rivet on his country the fetters of autocracy, and left it when the chains were loosened, like an unarmed slave, with limbs powerless from long inaction, exposed to the assaults of theory and licence.

We have no English Bossuet, and we have reason to be thankful that our national life was never so concentrated in the palace as to give a pre-eminence to the court pulpit sufficient to sustain such lofty flights of rhetorical magniloquence. But England produced in that same age a genius of grander and more truly religious soul, greater in his aspirations, and more noble in his life,—a man who never crooked the hinges of the knee to power; who raised his eloquent voice again and again in behalf of unviolated liberty of thought and conscience; who endeavoured to forward the reign of God’s justice upon earth; who, blind, old, deserted, clung with unquenchable ardour to the cause that was despised by the court, scorned by the great, and despaired of by the people; a name that will be as dear as his works to the most distant posterity, who was great and good, whether considered as Christian, poet, politician, or patriot. If France has her Bossuet, England has her Milton. The genius of one and of the other bears the same stamp of massive grandeur; the eloquence of one and of the other rose to sublimity and pierced the veil of mortality. But the French orator was the champion of authority and of the Church of Rome; the English poet was the child of freedom and of sacred truth; and if the works of Bossuet stand as proud memorials of the Court and Creed he adorned, the writings of Milton breathe an immortal spirit which changes of opinion will never consign to the records of the past, and which the revolutions of the world will never efface.

ART. VIII.—*Histoire des Livres Populaires, ou de la Littérature du Colportage, depuis le XV<sup>me</sup> Siècle jusqu'à l'Etablissement de la Commission de l'Examen des Livres du Colportage* (30 Novembre 1852). Par M. CHARLES NISARD, Secrétaire-adjoint de la Commission. \*2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1854.

ALTHOUGH the subject of this History of popular literature is exclusively French, it is impossible not to regard it as full of significance in reference to the same important class of publications in England. The laws which regulate the popular mind follow everywhere the same general analogies. Ignorance and superstition may be everywhere traced to the same sources; and the revolting examples of both which have come to light in the course of more than one criminal trial in England during the last year, are a painful evidence of the prevalence among ourselves of the same causes which are disclosed in M. Nisard's publication.

Few, even among the best informed readers of the literature of the day, will be prepared for the fact, that, side by side with the known productions of the press of Paris, there has existed from time immemorial in France another, and in its own sphere, hardly less influential, literature, addressing a totally different public, enjoying a separate and peculiar circulation, and possessing an organisation, both for production and for distribution, almost entirely independent of the ordinary machinery of literary commerce. Still less will they be prepared to learn that the number of volumes thus annually put into circulation throughout the length and breadth of France, amounts to *nearly ten millions*, at prices ranging from a franc down to a sous; or for the still more extraordinary fact, that, among this enormous number, with the exception of a few of the modern novels, hardly a single volume—at least in the form in which it is circulated by the hawkers—is the production of any writer whose works have ever attracted the attention of our readers. So that we are led to the singular conclusion that a *substratum* of publications, of enormous extent, supplies the demand and feeds the curiosity of the lower orders, utterly unconnected with the higher creations of French genius, coarser in form and in substance, and very slightly affected by the vicissitudes of taste and opinion.

Such is the 'Littérature du Colportage'—for more than three centuries almost the sole intellectual nutriment of the rural

population of France, and of that large section of the population of towns and cities who retain, unchanged and unmodified, all their provincial habits, peculiarities, and prejudices. Isolated, like the primitive class to whose rude tastes it ministers, from all the influences of the age, a large body of this literature has remained for three centuries almost entirely unimproved; whatever of modern infusion may, from time to time, have been introduced, has insensibly glided into the old channels; and of very many of the books now actually in circulation, it is no exaggeration to say, that (allowing for certain inevitable disparities) they are all but identical with their predecessors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—the same in subject-matter, the same in spirit and tone, the same in form of publication, the same even in the mechanical details of typography; the very texture and colour of the old paper is retained, and the illustrations presented in each successive year are exact reproductions of the rude woodcuts which adorned the original impressions.

Strange and inexplicable as this immobility may at first sight appear, it is a natural consequence of the habits and position of the class to which these rude publications are addressed, and will be found, in a greater or less degree, to characterise the rustic literature of most countries. The *Volks-bücher* of the Germans bear a striking similarity to the 'Livres Populaires' described by M. Nisard; and, like them, have been reproduced for successive generations with hardly a pretence of alteration. The same books, with a few local or national peculiarities, are found to have been current for immemorial years, in the other continental countries—Italy, Spain, Belgium, Holland, and even Switzerland. Many of the very same publications still maintain their old popularity among ourselves, against all the attractions of our various societies for the diffusion of knowledge; and, not to speak of 'Prophetic Almanacs,' 'Celestial Intelligencers,' and similar works, it may be said that the most popular in some respects of all the almanacs in use among our people—the well-known 'Moore's Almanac'—is not, in its issue for the present year, many steps of real progress in advance of the 'Shepherds' 'Kalendar' printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1493.

It would be a highly interesting study to trace, as has already been done for several of these countries separately, the general analogies of the 'People's Books' of the various nations, eastern and western; and to determine how far each has influenced or been influenced by the other. But M. Nisard's plan, which was directed towards one specific object, did not include any such inquiry. He confines himself to the popular



books of France, and indeed chiefly to their actual condition and character as they are in circulation at the present day.

With that superior energy and decision which, whatever be its other characteristics, have marked the administration of the present Emperor of the French, a commission was issued (on the 30th November, 1852), by M. Maupas, the Minister of Police, with power to call in and examine all the books that form part of that body of cheap literature which is circulated by *colportage*. It is hardly necessary to say, that by *colportage* is meant the system of licensed hawking or peddling, by which, in France, as in other countries, the secluded districts are supplied with the various commodities which form the object of this primitive species of locomotive trade. Among these the little books already referred to constitute a very notable item; and their production is a special branch of the book-trade in France. The publishing for *colportage* is carried on not so much in Paris, as in three or four great provincial centres, Troyes, Chatillon-sur-Seine, Nancy, Montpellier and Epinal; between these various establishments an active rivalry has been maintained, marked by all the same features which characterise the higher book-trade,—piracies, injunctions, questions of copyright, and angry suits at law. In two of these great depôts at Troyes, some of the publications were supplied to customers not by number but by weight;—almanacs being actually sold by the kilogramme!

The reader may imagine the excitement and alarm produced in these primitive regions by the first injunction issued under the Imperial Commission, requiring that all books designed for sale through the *colportage* should be forthwith sent in for examination; accompanied by a notification that, henceforward, in addition to the hawker's licence already required for his general trade, every book offered by him for sale should be provided with a special stamp of authorisation! Books came pouring in with a rapidity which those will best understand who have seen, under any of the arbitrary governments abroad, how the habitually tardy operations of individual enterprise are quickened by the impulse of an order from the higher powers. M. Nisard (who, indeed, maintains a studied reserve on many very important particulars) does not state the exact number; but we learn from a very interesting lecture 'On the Home Education of the Poor,' delivered some time since at St. Martin's Hall, by Cardinal Wiseman (to whom M. Nisard had supplied this and other details), that, before the date of that lecture, no less than 7500 books had been submitted to the judgment of the Commission!

Of course, M. Nisard's analysis extends but to a small proportion of this enormous collection; but, as he has reduced them all to classes, and has selected out of each class the most popular and the most characteristic, his account may be regarded as a sufficiently satisfactory sample. Indeed, the number of books actually described by him, amounts to no less than 460; comprising every variety of form, from the old-fashioned 4tos of the sixteenth century, down to the almost microscopic one sous volumes in 64mo, which the necessities of modern competition have forced into circulation.

The number and variety of almanacs which jostle each other in the hawkers' book-market is almost beyond belief. M. Nisard enumerates no less than one hundred\*, the names of which alone would form a study in themselves—almanacs of every variety of form; large almanacs and small almanacs; single, double, and triple almanacs—almanacs, again, of every political hue, as the National, Imperial, Constitutional, Republican, and Red; and almanacs of no political hue at all, as M. Pagnerre's 'National, qui ne contient rien de politique;' almanacs for every class and profession; as pocket almanacs and fireside almanacs; almanacs for town, and almanacs for country; shepherds' almanacs, soldiers' almanacs, traders' almanacs, farmers' almanacs, lovers' almanacs;—almanacs of the most opposite character; as the 'Anabaptiste' and the 'St. Vincent de Paul,' the 'Almanach du Crime,' and the 'Almanach des Bons Conseils;' the 'Bon Ermite,' and the 'Bon Vivant!'

Among the locally designated almanacs, the 'Liégeois' is the most ancient, as it is also the basis of most of the others. Many, indeed, of those enumerated by M. Nisard under very different designations, are in reality but varieties of this 'Almanach-souche.' It is found in a multitude of various forms,—the 'Petit Liégeois,' the 'Double Liégeois,' 'Très Double Liégeois,' 'Véritable Double Liégeois,' 'Triple Liégeois,' and 'Véritable Triple Liégeois.' Of these the first, or 'Petit Liégeois,' is by far the most extensively circulated. The earliest edition of which any trace can be found, is that of 1636, and the name of its compiler, the venerable Matthew Laensberg (who may be regarded as the Moore of French almanacs), still figures upon the title-page of each successive yearly issue.†

---

\* Of these, fully nine-tenths are issued from the provincial publishing establishments at Troyes, Epinal, Nancy, Chatillon-sur-Seine—only ten being published in Paris.

† M. Nisard, not finding, among the Liégeois almanacs submitted to the Commission, nor in the collections which he had the opportu-

The 'Liégeois' almanacs, however variously designated, are all 24mo; the variety of name, double, triple, &c., arising solely from the number of their pages. In part, the contents of all are, of course, the same; consisting of the ordinary topics which, in all countries, constitute the essentials of an almanac; — as the calendar, the church festivals, solar and lunar tables, lists of fairs and markets, public offices, &c. But, besides this, they all contain, according to their various dimensions, a greater or less amount of miscellaneous information, — astrological predictions, weather tables, horoscopes, agricultural precepts, riddles, interpretations of dreams, anecdotes, tales, culinary recipes, medical prescriptions, — odds and ends, in a word, of the most motley character, —

‘Beginning with the laws that keep  
The radiant planets in their courses;  
And ending with some precept deep  
For dressing eels or shoeing horses.’

The portion of their contents, however, which chiefly interests us, as illustrating the moral and intellectual condition of the public among whom they circulate, is the prophetic or astrological department. How far the faith of the purchasers responds to the pretensions of the prophet, it is, of course, difficult to pronounce. Many readers, no doubt, regard the predictions simply in the light of a jest, but there can be no doubt, too, that a large amount of credit still clings to them among the rural population. M. Nisard reports, not only that the circulation of these prophetic almanacs far exceeds that of the non-prophetic class, but also that one publication conducted on the opposite principle, and designed to counteract their evil tendency and to discredit their absurd pretensions, has proved a complete failure. As regards the views of the compilers themselves,

---

nity of examining, any edition printed at Liège itself, expresses an opinion (which he afterwards modifies) that this almanac never was printed at Liège at all. This, if true, would be not the least singular circumstance in the history of these curious little serials. But it is not true. It had been regularly printed at Liège for a long series of years, by a family named Bourguignon, the widow of one of whom sold the proprietorship of it to the present proprietor, P. J. Collardin; and the edition now before us (1843) contains a formal declaration, signed by V<sup>re</sup> C. Bourguignon, attesting that she has transferred to him the copyright, together with ‘the precious documents which secure to this publication the success that it has constantly enjoyed since its first appearance at the commencement of the 17th century.’

several of them, it is true, put forward their predictions in a light and playful spirit, and, indeed, without the least attempt to conceal their own consciousness of the absurdity. But the majority of them, on the other hand, make it equally plain that they desire to be seriously understood and implicitly believed. It is still seriously related of Nostradamus (the great prophet of one class of the almanacs) that he distinctly foretold, long before either event, the death of Henry II. and the massacre of St. Bartholomew, although the latter did not occur till six years after the death of the prophet. The well-known anecdote of Madame Dubarry's downfall\* is still appealed to in confirmation of the veracity of Matthew Laensberg, the Liégeois oracle.

One of the most curious circumstances of these predictions is, that, by a strange fiction, they are all ascribed to one of three mysterious individuals, whom popular tradition believes to

‘ Have learned the art which none may name,  
In Padua, far beyond the sea ; —

Michael Nostradamus, Matthew Laensberg, and Joseph Moulton; and even now the predictions of each successive year profess to be printed from certain ‘precious documents’ which were left behind by these worthies, and which are still declared to be in the possession of the fortunate almanac-makers.† Now, of these three reputed prophets, although the first, Nostradamus, is a historical character, the existence of the second, Laensberg, is much more than problematical, and the third, Moulton, is certainly a myth. Nostradamus was a crazy physician of St. Rémi, who published, during his lifetime, a collection of wild and fantastic

---

\* In the ‘Liégeois’ for 1774, under the predictions for April, one was to the effect that ‘une dame des plus favorisées jouera son ‘dernier rôle.’ Mme. Dubarry did her best to have the almanac suppressed, and frequently expressed an uneasy wish that ‘ce vilain ‘mois d’avril’ was past. In the beginning of May Louis XV. took small pox, and died after a very brief illness; and the consequent ruin of the ‘Dame Favorisée’s’ fortunes established those of the Liégeois oracle more firmly than ever.

† Thus the ‘Liégeois,’ year after year, professes in its title-page to be ‘supporté pour le méridien de Liège par Matthieu Laensbergh, ‘mathématicien’ (though he is said to have lived in the beginning of the 17th century); and the deed of transfer of the copyright of this almanac (which is printed on the reverse title) includes the ‘documents précieux qui assurent à cet annuaire le succès dont il a ‘constamment joui,’ and which profess to be the MSS. of Matthew Laensberg!

'Predictions,' which secured for him a brilliant reception in the superstitious court of Catherine de Medici, and have been the foundation of the very questionable celebrity which he has since enjoyed. Laensberg's admirers describe him as 'a learned canon of St. Bartholomew's at Liège, about the beginning of the seventeenth century;' but, unluckily for the pretension, no such name is found in the list of canons of St. Bartholomew, either then or at any other period. And (most unhappy fate of all) the redoubted 'Joseph Moul't, when his claims are tried by the test of history, dwindles down, from a mighty enchanter,—

Who, when in Salamanca's cave,  
Him listed his magic wand to wave,  
The bells would ring in Notre Dame,—

into an obsolete French adverb! An ignorant copyist transformed the original title of the almanac: 'Prophéties de Thomas I. (Illyric) MOULT utiles' ('the very useful Prophecies of Thomas 'Illyricus,' from which, originally in Italian, the so-called 'Moul't' is a translation), into the 'Prophéties de THOMAS JOSEPH 'MOULT, utiles,' ('the useful Prophecies of Thomas Joseph 'MOULT'!)\*

Another very curious branch of information assiduously cultivated in the more ancient of these publications, is the science of astrological influences, or of the control which the planets exercise over the destinies of man, and the means by which their evil tendencies may be counteracted, and their salutary action usefully turned to account. With this view a set of very singular diagrams (one of which bears a striking resemblance to the picture of Gulliver tied down by the Lilliputians) has been devised, representing by lines and figures the various planetary influences which rule the several organs of the human frame. Thus Aries rules the head and face, Taurus the throat and neck, Gemini the arms and hands, and so on for the rest. The object of these strange diagrams, therefore, is to point out at a glance, 'the several parts of the human frame with which the planets 'are respectively related and over which they rule, in order to 'guard us against touching with the iron, or opening with the 'lance, the veins which proceed therefrom, at a time when the 'planets severally related to these parts may be in conjunction

---

\* We need hardly wonder at this transformation, when we recollect that the learned and sagacious Dr. Dibdin himself transforms the obsolete adverb 'jouxte' (from the Latin *juxta*) into the name of a printer, and cautions his readers against the edition of Bassompierre's *Mémoires* 'by Jouxte!' (*Library Companion*, p. 513.)

'with another malignant planet, and not rather waiting for a good planet which may serve to countervail its malignity.' (Vol. i. p. 128.)

The almanac which deals most largely in this branch of science is the lineal descendant of the earliest known representative of this species of literature—the 'Shepherds' Almanac,' one edition of which, with the date 1493, is still preserved, but which is believed to have been in existence long before that year. The 'Shepherds' Almanac' will be best imagined if the reader picture to himself an almanac which was originally designed for a non-reading public, and in which the simple and primitive information is mainly conveyed, not by words or letters, but by symbols and pictorial representations. The symbols are in part arbitrary, but they are generally derived from some resemblance to the object which they are meant to represent. The days of the month are represented by the symbol or the portrait of the Saint of the day; and the information regarding each day is communicated in the form of some natural or conventional emblem. Thus the phases of the moon are indicated by circles, crescents, reversed crescents, oblique crescents, &c. Sundays are marked by a cross; working-days by a triangle. Days favourable for the operation of bleeding are registered by a star; days favourable for cupping, by a rude cupping-glass; days when we may safely take pills, by a circle with diameters intersecting at right angles. If the hair may be cut, you see a pair of scissors; if the nails may be pared, a hand. Safe days for operating on the eyes are shown by an eye; days for agricultural labour, by a hoe; for cutting trees, by a hatchet; and so on for the other prescriptions or representations.

This singular calendar appears to be no longer published separately; but it is still preserved as a part of some of the other almanacs. The 'Messagers Boiteux' reprint it regularly, year after year. M. Nisard says that the Liégeois have begun to omit it; but this can only be true of the Liégeois published in France. The 'Liégeois' almanacs of Liége, now before us, all reproduce at full length, not only this part of the ancient Shepherds' Almanac, but all the other characteristics of that most primitive publication.

Turning to M. Nisard's second head, Sciences and Arts, under which one naturally expects to find information as to the state of scientific knowledge among the patrons of the *littérature du colportage*, it is amusing to find that the 'sciences' to which M. Nisard refers are those of magic, astrology, divination, chiromancy, oneirismancy, and the minor departments of supernatural study, such as the oracle, the art of cup-tossing, &c.;

nor is there any branch of this entire literature which enjoys a wider and more steady popularity.

Magic is divided into two kinds, *Magie Blanche* and *Magie Noire*. M. Nisard does not explain the distinction; but we trust we shall not trespass on the privileges of the initiated, if we venture a conjecture that by the former is meant the science founded upon the hidden, but yet lawful use of the secrets of nature, whereas the latter necessarily involves an unlawful commerce with the world below. The latter science, we regret to say, is by far the more popular of the two. The principal books in this department circulated by the *colporteurs*, are the 'Grand Grimoire'; the 'Enchiridion Leonis Papæ'; the 'Triangle des Pactes'; the 'Secrets du Grand Albert'; the 'Secrets du Petit Albert'; and the 'Monde Enchanté.'

The name *Grimoire* seems to be a corruption of the title of the analogous Italian collection called *Rimario*; a collection of rhymes (*rime*) or spells, from which it is in great part compiled. M. Nisard gives a full analysis of the contents of this *Grimoire*. Perhaps it will be enough for our purpose to extract an entry from what we may call the 'Red Book' of the world below, containing an enumeration of the Grand Staff of the Satanic army. From this we learn that it consists of three 'superior spirits, — Emperor Lucifer, Prince Belzebub, and Grand Duke Astaroth; together with five inferior officials, — Lucifuge, prime minister; Satanachia, general-in-chief; Fleuretty, lieutenant-general; Sargatanas, brigadier; and Nebiros, field-marshal. We shall not trouble the reader with the names of eighteen subordinates who are under the command of those already enumerated; but, as it may interest him to know the special departments intrusted to each of the great officers, we shall briefly say, that the Prime Minister Lucifuge has power over the wealth and treasures of the world; General Satanachia is the special ruler of the fair sex, old and young; Lieutenant-General Fleuretty 'has power to do whatever one wishes at night, and can cause hail to fall wherever he pleases; Brigadier Sargatanas 'can render men invisible, can transport them to distant places, open locks, &c.;' and Marshal Nebiros 'can cause evil to befall any one he pleases, enable us to find the Hand of Glory, predict future events, and teach us all secrets, whether of the mineral, the vegetable, or the animal world.' (Vol. i. p. 165.) It is plain that, under the patronage of one or other of these great powers, almost every conceivable magical operation may be successfully conducted. The manner of conducting each successfully is detailed in other

smaller publications, which describe the process to be followed in executing the several spells; the most powerful of which are known under the name of the 'Red Dragon,' the 'Black Hen,' the 'Hand of Glory,' and the 'Thundering Wand.' Should the reader feel disposed to try his hand upon any of these, or upon any one of the varieties of compacts enumerated in the 'Triangle des Pactes,'\* he will find in M. Nisard's book full details not alone of the marvellous virtues which they possess, but of the whole form to be observed in order to avoid danger and to insure success; the form of compact to be entered into; the terms on which the spirit is to be compelled to the will of the operator; the devices by which his malignant schemes may be evaded; and the incantation by which he may be safely 'laid,' when he shall have fulfilled the operator's behests.

The 'Grand Grimoire,' the 'Triangle des Pactes,' and the 'Véritable Dragon Rouge,' are all avowedly systems of Black or unlawful magic. On the contrary, the 'Enchiridion Leonis' (III.) Papæ, and the 'Manual of Pope Honorius' (the former translated from the Latin), two little volumes absurdly attributed to the Popes whose names they bear, are a singular mixture of magic and religion; consisting, for the most part, of the strangest of travesties of church prayers and other sacred formularies. The formularies thus travestied are in the main a mere jargon of unmeaning words; but they are commended as infallible talismans against all imaginable evils. One of them, for instance, consists of a long string of so-called names (many of them utter nonsense) of our Lord; another, of similar names of the Blessed Virgin, the wearing of which is declared to be an infallible safeguard for the bearer, whether by sea or land. Then come charms against various evils. Thus against the falling sickness: 'Whisper into the ear of the patient these words,—*Gaspar fert myrrham, thus Melchior, Balthasar aurum*; and he will rise up instantly. In order to cure him radically, you must get three iron nails, the length of his little finger. Bury them deeply in the place of his first fall, and over each of them name the patient's name.'

M. Nisard professes himself unable to divine what is the object of a charm which is prescribed (vol. i. p. 189.) to be used *pour être dur*, 'in order to become hard.' We have seen it suggested

---

\* This work deserves to be more popular than any of its competitors, as it comes into the field armed with a solemn authentication, confirmed by the autograph of 'Lucifuge Rôfocale himself.' See this curious autograph in fac-simile, vol. i. p. 177.



that *dur* means 'bullet-proof.' At all events here it is:— 'Write upon two separate billets in your own blood as follows: on the first, *Ranuc, Malior*; on the second, *Hora consummatum est, in te confedo* (sic) *Satana*. You must swallow one of these, and wear the other round your neck.'

Another popular book with the *colportage* is the 'Monde Enchanté,' chiefly compiled from Bekker's well-known but prolix treatise on Demonology, or rather from the French translation of it. The 'Monde Enchanté,' although but a summary of the subject, yet enters into details which no doubt will astonish the reader unlearned in supernatural lore. It reviews minutely all the different classes of demons; discriminates their characters, functions, and habits; and describes particularly their great festival, well known by the name of the Witches' Sabbath; and although the author confesses that the number of devils is so large as to render it at first sight impossible to be accurately ascertained, yet he assures us that 'a man who had specially applied himself to the inquiry, at last succeeded in determining it with precision;' having discovered their number with as perfect accuracy as though he had counted them over one by one, and passed them in review before him. 'This writer,' he adds, 'assures us that he has ascertained their number to be (errors excepted) seven million, four hundred and four thousand, nine hundred and twenty-six!'

A set off against all these demoralising extravagancies was attempted in a caricature of their absurdity, entitled 'Histoire de M. Oufic, ou l'Incrédulité et la Mécréance aux sortilèges aux diables, magiciens, &c., convaincue par les écrits des anciens cabalistes et démonographes.' But M. Nisard is obliged to confess, that it is less popular and less extensively circulated than the 'Petit Albert,' the 'Grand Grimoire,' and its other rivals of 'the dusky art.'

The jest-books, books of anecdotes, and facetiæ of the *colportage*, do not appear to be specially characteristic. They seem closely to resemble our own collections of the same character. The great heroes of these anecdotes, though in very different ways, are the Duc de Roquelaure, a kind of French Laird of Logan, who flourished in the court of the Grand Monarque, and died in 1683, and a more plebeian humourist, M. Briolet, who lived in the following century. A large proportion of the anecdotes relating to the former are licentious in the extreme.

There is a good deal of genuine humour, not unmixed, however, with profanity, in many of the compositions described in the chapter on 'Discourses, Funeral Orations,' &c. Most of

these are the productions of a so-called 'Academy of Troyes' — an association of humourists just such as would have gladdened Swift's heart to contemplate — which was established in that city, about the middle of the last century, chiefly under the inspiration of the celebrated advocate J. P. Grosley, best known to English scholars by his learned essay on the pretended Spanish conspiracy against Venice in 1618. Like many similar aspirants, the academicians of Troyes failed completely in their own country; but, venturing to submit the fruit of their lucubrations to the more enlightened judgment of the literary *salons* of Paris, their 'Mémoires' were at once rewarded with a popularity the echo of which is still heard in the *colportage*.

One of the most curious samples of this species of composition is the 'Testament et dernières Paroles de Michel Morin.' Morin is described as beadle of the church of Beauséjour in Picardy. In the hands of the witty author, he is made the Don Quixote or Friar Gerund of the age of panegyrics; and his character and history are used as the vehicle of a most amusing caricature of the fulsome oratory which it was the fashion of the time to lavish upon the memory of the most commonplace and even the most worthless, provided they had left wealth enough to cover their poverty of reputation. There is a 'Sermon in Proverbs,' too, the great merit of which consists in stringing together in logical sequence a series of the most motley and unconnected adages, so as to produce an orderly and intelligible discourse. The effect is extremely curious, and reminds one forcibly, although in a different order, of the oddities of the well-known German preacher, Abraham de Sancta Clara, whose peculiarities Schiller has successfully imitated in the discourse of his Capuchin in 'Wallenstein's Lager.'

Two very long chapters are devoted to the books of the *colportage* which relate to 'Religion et Morale,' and Religious Poetry. It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that the books comprised under these denominations constitute the real popular religious literature of France. That literature forms a perfectly distinct department. It possesses a special and independent organisation, under the direction of the clergy; nor was it comprehended among the objects to which the Commission du Colportage was charged to apply itself. The literature submitted to the Commission and described by M. Nisard, though it comprises some unexceptionable books, is for the most part of a far lower and coarser stamp. Very many of the books do not pretend in the least to the devotional character; where they make such pretension, the devotion is generally of a

very low and questionable type, and abounds with apocryphal histories and meaningless legends; the moral teaching, when it seeks to be practical, often descends into dangerous and objectionable details; and, in a word, the general tendency of the class is towards a hard and vulgar formalism. We learn, indeed, from M. Nisard that the great majority of them are discountenanced by the clergy, although they maintain a clandestine popularity among the rude and superstitious peasantry, to the partial exclusion of the sounder literature which the clergy seek to encourage.

The 'Religious poetry' of the *colportage* deserves a separate article. It remained, with hardly an exception, the very same for centuries, and most of the pieces which M. Nisard describes, date from the fifteenth century, and perhaps even earlier. Not that there does not exist in the religious literature of France any poetry of more modern origin. On the contrary, there is no country where it is more abundant; every diocese has its own hymn book, every religious association its own collection of *cantiques*. But none of these, although some of them, especially the 'Cantiques de St. Sulpice,' possess very great merit, have succeeded in dislodging their old friends from their place by the winter fireside of the French peasant, or their hold upon his imagination and his heart. Their exceeding simplicity, their highly dramatic style, and their perfect adaptations in imagery, in allusions, and in illustrations, to the peasant life and the peasant character, have been their safeguard through all the social, political, and religious revolutions which they have out-lived.

The *cantiques spirituels* described by M. Nisard are a series of religious ballads or romances, partly scriptural, partly legendary. Of the former class are the ancient drama or mystery of the Nativity, the Sacrifice of Abraham, Joseph and his Brethren, Judith and Holofernes, the Prodigal: of the latter, the legend of our Lady of Liesse, of St. Barbara, St. Eustache, Geneviève of Brabant, St. Alexis, St. Hubert, Patron of the chase, and several others.\* Their chief common characteristic is extreme simplicity; and, although there is no great elevation, whether

---

\* It may be well to say that these romances are by no means exclusively French in their origin. The very same romances—not only the same in substance, but often even identical in the very form—are found in Italian, in Spanish (where they form the great treasure-house from which Calderon de la Barca has drawn the material of his religious dramas); and, above all, in German. Every one of the above romances, and many more, may still be found in the German *Volks-bücher*, enumerated by Görres and others.

moral or intellectual, in any of them, they are, for the most part, marked by a purity and a fidelity to nature which, in healthful effect upon the feelings, may well be believed to outweigh far more brilliant and striking qualities.

The last branch of the hawkers' literature reviewed by M. Nisard comprises its Fiction; and we may include under the same head the lives of celebrated robbers, sharpers, adventurers, and other Newgate heroes, which he has placed in a different category. M. Nisard divides this important branch of hawkers' literature into two classes—the ancient and the modern. The former still maintains an almost undisputed popularity in some remote rural districts; the latter has driven out his predecessor among the *ouvriers* and *grisettes* of the towns and cities, and is fast creeping in among the younger portion even of the agricultural population of many of the departments.

It is true that many of the books sold by the *colporteurs*, and some of those not the least popular, are quite unobjectionable. For a long time the tales of Madame Cottin, authoress of the well-known 'Exiles of Siberia,' enjoyed almost a monopoly of the market; and more recently her popularity has been shared by two other lady-novelists, Mesdames D'Aulnoy and Daubenton. Whatever may be the defects of these writers as regards taste, their moral tone is not liable to serious criticism. It would have been well if the trade had confined itself to their works, or even to those of a still more prolific writer, Ducray-Duminil, whose novels fall but little short in number of those of Mr. James, and whose works in general, although not quite beyond exception as regards their moral tendency, are purity itself in comparison with the garbage of the later school of the fiction of the *colportage*.

But, although these works, and such as these, together with many of our own recognised favourites, 'Robinson Crusoe,' 'Telemachus,' 'Gil Blas,' and the 'Arabian Nights,' have always maintained a steady circulation, it is equally certain that a similar, though more clandestine, popularity was enjoyed by such works as the 'Decameron,' the 'Cent Nouvelles,' the 'Romans' of Voltaire, Rousseau's 'Héloïse' and 'Confessions,' Diderot's Tales, the more disgusting tales of Crébillon Fils, and others of more modern date, unknown in England even by name, but in principles and in colouring equally detestable. It is only necessary to cast an eye over the titles of the long series enumerated by M. Nisard in a note (vol. ii. pp. 579-581.), in order to see how demoralising must be the tendency, and how fatal the effect of such a literature.

M. Nisard, as we have already observed, maintains a careful

reserve as to the remedial measures contemplated or adopted by the Commission du Colportage. We learn, however, from the lecture of Cardinal Wiseman, referred to in the beginning of this article, that its first measure, after the calling in of the books for examination, was to order fully three-fourths of the whole number to be at once withdrawn from circulation. We collect, too, from the author himself, that an attempt has been made, as yet seemingly without much success, by the publishers in whose hands the *colportage* trade has hitherto been centered, to supply with approved and unobjectionable books the void thus suddenly created; and he appears to hold out something like a hope, that he may give us, in a future publication, an account of the new '*Littérature du Colportage*,' which it is thus attempted to inaugurate. This, no doubt, is one of the great social problems of the age, hardly, if at all, inferior in interest to that of primary education itself; because it involves the success of that self-education, which bears even more directly on the practical formation of the character of the individual, and the determination, for good or for evil, at the outset, of the moral principles which, whether unfelt or openly avowed, are destined to be his guide of action throughout life. It is plain that the arbitrary enactments of a government, or the remedial measures of a commission, can but reach the externals: they deal with the symptoms rather than with the disease. Nor can we venture to hope that any real progress has been made towards its eradication, until we shall have an opportunity of judging of the character of the new literature which it is proposed to substitute, and of its suitableness for the true exigencies of so important a crisis.

Meanwhile the subject is one in which we ourselves have a concern far deeper and more practical than that arising from the mere literary or antiquarian considerations which it involves. Such a revelation from abroad should awaken our curiosity, or rather a far more earnest feeling, as to the condition of affairs at home. *Proximus ardet*. We have before us at this moment several narratives of witchcraft, charms, and singular superstitions, in various parts of England, which would furnish a practical commentary on the blackest pages of the *Grand Grimoire*. The English almanacs for the present year contain predictions just as detailed and announced with quite as sober an air, as those of the '*Almanach Prophétique*' itself.\* And, as regards

---

\* '*Raphael's Prophetic Messenger*' is a literal transcript of the French Prophetic Almanacs. '*Copestick's Prophetic and Commercial Almanac*,' with a less solemn pretentious display of science,

its corrupting and demoralising tendencies, we fear that there are to be found publications in our literature for the poor which may not unsuccessfully dispute that 'bad eminence' with the worst dregs of the '*Littérature du Colportage*.' Let any man read Mr. Mayhew's brief, but pregnant, notices of the 'Coster-literature.' Let him read of the sale *by millions\** of the 'gallows' literature' which is by far the most popular ware of our literary hawkers; of a single individual's selling on a Saturday night two thousand such publications; of families clubbing their pence to indulge this diseased curiosity; of the groups of listeners assembled even in the remote villages by the scanty light of a fire and drinking in with eager ears the exciting narrative, which initiates them in the vices of great cities; and of the morbid attraction of these publications to the young of both sexes. The retailers of these publications are, as Lord Campbell forcibly observed in bringing forward his measure for the suppression of obscene literature, 'moral poisoners'; and we are satisfied that the Lord Chief Justice and M. Nisard have both done service to the interests of public morality in arming the law with additional power to crush these abuses.

On the other hand, we are bound in fairness to say, that much has been done of late years in this country to bring excellent works of instruction and entertainment within reach of the middle and lower classes. The Railway book-stall has established a place for literature by the side of the great improvement in modern locomotion; and its contents are by no means worthless or contemptible. In one way or in another the demand for literary amusement will be supplied to the people, and it is of vital importance that this supply should be drawn from pure waters, and not from that subterranean current which is tainted with the superstitions of the past and the vices of the present age.

---

is equally ludicrous in its guesses at the future. The death of the Emperor Nicholas made sad work in the predictions for 1855.

\* 'To show the extent of the trade in "execution broadsheets," I obtained returns of the number of copies relating to the principal executions of late, which had been sold:—

Of Rush . . . .	2,500,000 copies.
„ the Mannings . . . .	2,500,000 „
„ Courvoisier . . . .	1,666,000 „
„ Good . . . .	1,650,000 „
„ Corder . . . .	1,650,000 „
„ Greenacre . . . .	1,666,000 „

(*Mayhew's London Labour and the London Poor*,  
vol. i. p. 284.)

ART. IX.—*Tracts and other Publications on Metallic and Paper Currency*. By the Right Honourable Lord OVERSTONE. Collected by J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. 1857. 8vo. [Not published.]

NUMEROUS and valuable as have been Mr. M'Culloch's contributions to monetary science, his latest labour—that of collecting and editing the tracts and other publications of Lord Overstone—must be regarded, in so far as relates to immediate practical results, as one of the most useful and important. At the present juncture, when Parliament may be called upon to review our monetary system, and to decide on the expediency of renewing the existing charter of the Bank of England, the value of these remarkable productions cannot be over-estimated. The only thing to be regretted is, that they should have been reprinted, not for publication, but for private distribution only. It is due to the diffusion of knowledge upon a question deeply affecting the well-being of the community at large that they should be given to the public. As literary compositions, they are masterpieces; as contributions to monetary science, they rank with the congenial and analogous productions of Adam Smith, Horner, and Ricardo. It may, indeed, be truly affirmed that, as regards the investigation of questions peculiarly relating to the regulation of the circulation and to the theory of banking, Lord Overstone is in some respects superior to his illustrious predecessors. He is superior to Adam Smith in the choice and in the consistent use of the terms he employs, and in that logical precision which is the chief beauty of philosophical language; he is superior to Horner and Ricardo in the application to the complex phenomena of the money market of that searching analysis which detects the fallacies lurking beneath undefined and ambiguous terms, and reveals elementary principles previously unseen. Adam Smith, as has been shown by Mr. M'Culloch in the admirable notes appended to his edition of the 'Wealth of Nations,' fell into some fundamental errors. Horner and Ricardo rescued monetary science from the anarchy into which it had been thrown by the suspension of metallic payments, and restored it to the status in which it had been left by Adam Smith. Lord Overstone, while effectually disposing of the misconceptions and fallacies of the present representatives of Bosanquet, Castlereagh, and Vansittart, has built upon the foundations laid by Smith, and completed the structure which the illustrious founder of Economical Science had commenced.

This is high praise; but it will not be regarded as undeserved or as exaggerated by any one who has leisure to peruse, and ability to understand, the very simple and lucid exposition of elementary principles presented in the volume now before us: nor will the judgment we have ventured to pronounce be reversed by any competent authority who will contrast the state of the science of Currency and Banking, as it was left by Adam Smith and restored by Ricardo, with the state to which it has been advanced in the writings of Lord Overstone.\*

Adam Smith explained the nature and extent of the advantages which may be obtained by the establishment of a convertible paper currency. He showed that paper money, consisting of bank notes issued by people of undoubted credit, payable upon demand, without any condition, and in fact always readily paid as soon as issued, is in every respect equal in value to gold and silver. That the whole of the paper money, of every description, which can be easily circulated in any country, can never exceed the value of the gold and silver of which it supplies the place, or which, the commerce being the same, would circulate there if there were no paper money. That the substitution of paper in the room of gold and silver money replaces a very expensive instrument of commerce for one much less costly, and sometimes equally convenient; and that when such substitution is effected, the floating capital of the country—the whole quantity of maintenance, tools, and materials by which industry is put in motion—may be increased by the whole value of the gold and silver which is disengaged from circulation.

But although Adam Smith thus correctly explained the nature, the extent, and the ultimate limits of the advantages to be derived from the substitution of paper for metallic money, yet he not only failed to present a sufficiently comprehensive view of the theory of Currency and Banking, but enunciated a doctrine which, having been extensively adopted under the sanction of his high authority, has become a prolific source of error. He failed to recognise the important and generic distinction between issuing notes and making advances from deposits,—in other words, between creating additional circulation and lending upon securities portions of the circulation already in existence; and

---

\* We are also indebted to Lord Overstone and Mr. M'Culloch for another volume of great interest to the history of monetary science, entitled 'A select Collection of scarce and valuable Tracts on Paper Currency and Banking from the Originals, by Hume, Wallace, Thornton, Ricardo, Blake, and others, with a Preface, Notes, and Index, reprinted December, 1857.'



he affirmed the principle, that 'if bankers are restricted from issuing any notes for less than a certain sum, and if they are subjected to the obligation of an immediate and unconditional payment of such notes as soon as presented, their trade may with safety to the public be rendered in all other respects perfectly free.' This doctrine, first promulgated in 1776, was practically refuted by the excessive issue of bank notes which occurred during the monetary crisis of 1792; but unfortunately for the progress of science, the author of the '*Wealth of Nations*' did not live to profit by the experience of that eventful year.

While Adam Smith explained the nature and determined the limits of the advantages which can be derived from the substitution of a paper for a metallic circulation, he left to future inquirers the solution of some of the most important problems in the science of Currency and Banking. But he had no immediate successors. During the long period from the publication of the '*Wealth of Nations*' in 1776 to the suspension of cash payments in 1797, the mantle of the prophet had not been caught. That suspension not only arrested progress, but caused retrogression. When the currency ceased to conform to its standard, the idea of a standard was lost. When the bank note was released from its promise to pay in gold, what was the payment which it promised to effect? It promised to pay in pounds sterling. But as the pound which it promised and which it was required under the Suspension Act to pay, did not consist of a given quantity of gold, in what else did it consist? To answer this question was no easy task. Merchants, bankers, economists, and statesmen sought with bewildered zeal the solution of the mysterious problem — What is a pound? Mr. Henry Thornton defined a pound sterling to be the interest of 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* in the three per cent. Government stock. Lord Castlereagh improved upon the definition, and contended that a pound sterling is 'a sense of value;' while the Chancellor of the Exchequer, less solicitous for scientific precision, was satisfied with obtaining the sanction of the House of Commons for his celebrated resolution, that depreciated paper was regarded by the public as equivalent to coin.

The crased foundations of monetary science were restored through the labours of Huskisson, Horner, and Ricardo. Light redawned in the report of the Bullion Committee. Ricardo's reply to Bosanquet dispelled the still lingering obscurity. On the resumption of metallic payments in 1819, 'the dark age of currency had passed.'

A brief reference to the progress of public opinion on questions relating to the regulation of the currency, from the re-

resumption of cash payments to the promulgation of the more advanced views of Lord Overstone, cannot fail to be at once interesting and instructive.

The first object to which all the efforts of Horner and Ricardo were directed was the restoration of the standard; and on the attainment of this object by Sir Robert Peel's Act of 1819 they erroneously conceived that the legal obligation of immediate convertibility which it imposed was a sufficient security against the danger of future over-issue, depreciation, and suspension; that the paper currency would be subject to no fluctuations other than those which would equally occur under a purely metallic circulation; and that the important work which they had undertaken was fully and finally performed. Ricardo, indeed, had incidentally shown, that immediate convertibility, although it would secure equivalency between paper and gold, yet could not prevent an increase of issues sufficient to lower the value both of notes and coin in relation to foreign currencies; and we cannot but believe that further experience would have led this profound and original thinker to follow out this principle to its legitimate practical conclusion, and to correct the error of Adam Smith,—that the issue of bank notes requires no other limitation than that imposed by the obligation of immediate and unconditional payment in gold.

The panic of 1825 taught a lesson which it was impossible to disregard. Horner and Ricardo had been lost to science; but Mr. Tooke, aspiring to be their legitimate successor, published in 1826 an able work, in which he not only supported the principles of the bullionists who had carried the Act of 1819 for the resumption of metallic payments, but demonstrated, by an elaborate reference to the increase in the amount of the circulation, and to the advance of general prices consequent thereon, that the obligation of immediate convertibility imposed by the Act of 1819 was an insufficient security against excessive issue. He affirmed the fundamental principle, that 'the only criterion of excessive issue is an efflux of bullion.' He showed, by quotations from the Stamp Office returns presented to Parliament, that in 1824 and 1825 the Bank of England, as well as the numerous provincial banks, in utter disregard of the criterion presented by a continuous efflux of bullion, exercised to an enormous extent the power of over-issue left to them by the Act of 1819. And he explained how these excessive issues added fuel to the flame of speculation, inflated prices, and induced an all but fatal collapse. Mr. Tooke's work of 1826 may possibly have contributed in no

inconsiderable degree to promote the reception of the more enlightened views regarding the regulation of the Currency which at that time began to prevail.

It would be unjust to the Directors of the Bank of England not to record the fact, that they were amongst the foremost to discover and to admit, that from the resumption of cash payments in 1819 to the panic in 1825, the circulation was not regulated by any definite and established principle. In 1819 they had passed, and laid before Parliament, a solemn resolution, in which they formally denied that the state of the Exchanges is affected by the amount of the circulation. In 1827 they rescinded that discreditable resolution; and in 1832 the evidence given by the most intelligent of the Bank Directors before the Parliamentary Committee of that year, contrasts in an extraordinary manner with the evidence which had been given only thirteen years before, and affords a very satisfactory proof of the rapid progress which sound principles had made in the public mind, and especially amongst the Directors of the Bank of England, during that period. The evidence of the then Governor of the Bank, Mr. Horsley Palmer, supported by the concurrent testimony of his colleagues, Mr. Ward and Mr. Norman, would constitute no bad summary of the true principles upon which the issues of the Bank should be managed. It was unanimously conceded, that the convertibility of the notes of the Bank ought to be secured by regulating the amount of the issues with reference to the state of the foreign exchanges; that the increase or diminution of gold in the hands of the Bank ought to be taken as the only safe test of a favourable or unfavourable state of the exchanges; and that the amount of the paper issues ought to be made to vary with a direct reference to the fluctuations in the amount of specie.

It is one thing to see what ought to be done, and another and a very different thing to devise the means of doing it: one thing to assent to a principle, another to bring it into practical operation. The expansive force of steam had been known for ages; but it required the creative genius of a Watt to make it the instrument of an industrial revolution. The principle adopted by the Directors, that the circulation should be made to vary in exact conformity with the variations of the bullion in their coffers, was perfect; but the arrangement which they devised for securing this conformity was lamentably defective. The crises of 1837 and 1839 were its fruits. In neither were the variations in the circulation made to correspond with those of the bullion. Issues increased when bullion diminished, and

diminished when it increased. A brief examination of the rule adopted by the Directors will show us that these were its necessary results; and will at the same time aid us in acquiring a full and distinct perception of the working and of the efficacy of the more scientific regulation which was devised by Lord Overstone as its substitute, and which was ultimately embodied in the Act of 1844.

The available funds of the Bank, consisted of the notes which it issued, and of the deposits which its customers placed at its disposal; the reserve of coin and notes being then equally applicable to the payment of the notes, and to the payment of the deposits. Now the rule adopted by the Directors was (the exchanges being previously at par, and the circulation consequently at its full amount) to invest two-thirds of these funds—circulation and deposits—in securities; to keep these securities at a uniform amount; and to increase or diminish their issues with the increase or diminution of the aggregate amount of their bullion and their deposits. It is apparent that this rule would have been perfectly effectual, had the holders of notes been the only parties entitled to draw out the gold; because in this case every diminution in the gold would have been accompanied by a corresponding diminution in the amount of the circulation. But the depositors had an equal right with the holders of notes to draw out the gold; and therefore the bullion might be diminished or even wholly exhausted, without the withdrawal of a single bank note from the channels of circulation. Let us suppose the state of the Bank to be

Circulation.	Deposits.	Bullion.
£	£	£
18,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000

It is obvious that were the holders of notes to pay in 1,000,000*l.* in exchange for bullion for exportation, the circulation and the bullion would both be diminished by 1,000,000*l.*; and it is equally self-evident that were the owners of deposits, not being at the same time holders of notes, to draw out gold for exportation to the amount of 1,000,000*l.*, the bullion would be diminished by that amount, while there would be no diminution whatever in the amount of the note circulation.

The plan for the regulation of their issues which the Directors announced to the Parliamentary Committee of 1832, brought forth its fruits in 1836. The '*Gazette*' returns of the circulation and bullion from January 1836 to February 1837, give the following results:—

	Circulation.	Bullion.
	£	£
1836.		
January 12th -	17,262,000	7,078,000
August 23rd -	18,061,000	6,325,000
1837.		
February 10th -	17,808,000	4,032,000

Thus we see that from the 12th January to the 25th August the circulation was increased by 799,000*l.*, while the bullion was diminished by 753,000*l.*; and that from January 1836 to February 1837 the circulation was increased by 546,000*l.*, while the bullion was decreased by 3,046,000*l.* Such was the total and melancholy failure of the plan adopted by the Directors for carrying out the principle to which they had become converts, of regulating the currency by the Foreign exchanges, and of making the note circulation expand and contract as the bullion increased and diminished. They saw with sufficient distinctness the object to be obtained; but the means of obtaining it they failed to discern.

The soundness of the views developed by Mr. Horsley Palmer, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Norman, before the Parliamentary Committee of 1832, had done much towards conciliating that degree of public favour which led to the renewal of the Charter; and on the announcement of their rule for bringing their views into practical operation, it was confidently expected and believed that the convertibility of the currency would be secured by regulating the amount of issue with a reference to the state of the exchanges; that an increase or a diminution of gold in the hands of the Bank would be taken as the only certain and safe test of the favourable or unfavourable state of the exchanges; and that consequently the amount of the note circulation would be made to vary with a direct reference to the fluctuations in the amount of bullion in the Bank. As the 'Gazette' returns revealed results directly opposite to those so confidently anticipated, the disappointment was extreme. Confidence gave place to uncertainty and alarm. The conduct of the Bank Directors, which had been extolled in 1832, was denounced in 1837. All the evils of the monetary and commercial pressure were attributed to their mismanagement; and they were assailed not only for the adoption of an ineffectual rule, but for a systematic departure from it, while professing to be guided by it. These charges were supported by a reference to the 'Gazette' returns. Mr. Horsley Palmer, the author of the new system of management, undertook its defence. He made the case against the Bank stronger than before. He did not attempt to controvert the fact, that the variations in the

amount of the circulation did not correspond with those of the bullion; and in endeavouring to show that the securities had been kept at a nearly uniform amount, he disclosed the astounding fact, that the 'Gazette' returns did not give an accurate statement of the actual position of the Bank. The public were now thoroughly bewildered; confusion was worse confounded. Alarm and distrust prevailed; and, under the existing disappointment and pressure, all hopes of escaping from the evils resulting from irregular expansions and contractions of the circulation were for the moment abandoned. It was under these circumstances that Lord Overstone gave to the public the first of that remarkable series of tracts, in which the true principles upon which a convertible paper currency should be regulated were for the first time propounded.

The Bank of England was, from its first establishment, both a bank of issue and a bank of deposit and discount. So also were all the minor banks of issue throughout the kingdom. The two functions were universally conjoined; and, in consequence of this constant conjunction, were regarded as inseparably connected. The advances of the banks were made indiscriminately from their own promissory notes, and from the deposits placed at their disposal by their customers; and when their promissory notes displaced the coin, and became the predominating element in the local circulations, they became also a prominent element in the deposits placed at the disposal of the banks, so that it was difficult if not impossible to distinguish between the advances made with notes issued *de novo* by the banks and the advances made with notes drawn from deposits. In either case the circulation in the hands of the public was equally increased. The identical effects were regarded as proceeding from identical causes; and hence, in the conception of bankers, merchants, and the public, the functions of issue and of discount became inseparably connected. Hence, too, the failure of Adam Smith and his followers, of Horner, and of Ricardo, to effect an analysis of the phenomena of the market sufficiently strict and exhaustive to enable them to present a perfect theory of currency and banking. Such an analysis was effected by Lord Overstone. Bringing high theoretical ability to bear upon the most extensive practical experience, he severed the inveterate association which identified advances from issues with advances from deposits; and in so doing, placed in the hands of the Directors of the Bank of England the appropriate means of giving practical effect to the enlightened views which they had the merit of having expounded in their evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1832.

Lord Overstone's very original views regarding the regulation of the Currency were first presented to the public in 1837, in the tract entitled 'Reflections suggested by a Perusal of Mr. Horsley Palmer's Pamphlet on the Causes and Consequences of the Pressure on the Money Market.' We give them in the words of the noble author:—

'The Bank, it must be observed, acts in two capacities; as a manager of the circulation, and as a body performing the functions of an ordinary banking concern. The duties of these two characters, though very often united in the same party, are in themselves perfectly distinct. In the principle laid down by the Bank for its own guidance, the separate and distinct nature of these two characters has not been sufficiently attended to. The rules applicable to its conduct as a manager of the currency are mixed with the rules applicable to its conduct as a simple banker, and the rule or principle under discussion is the result of this mixture. As a manager of the currency it is undoubtedly a sound rule by which to guide itself, that against the amount of notes out it shall hold at its disposal securities and specie; that the amount of securities shall be invariable; and that consequently all fluctuations in the amount of notes out shall be met by a corresponding fluctuation in the amount of specie in deposit; thus the public, and not the Bank, will be made the regulators of the amount of the circulation, and that amount will, by this principle, be made to fluctuate precisely as it would have fluctuated had the currency been purely metallic.

'For the regulation of the conduct of the Bank as a manager of the currency, this rule is perfectly unobjectionable, and rests indeed upon the soundest principles. But when the same rule is further applied to the regulation of its conduct as a banking concern, it is necessarily found to be wholly impracticable. It is in the nature of banking business that the amount of its deposits should vary with a variety of circumstances; and as its amount of deposits varies, the amount of that in which those deposits are invested (*viz.* the securities) must vary also. It is therefore quite absurd to talk of the Bank, in its character of a banking concern, keeping the amount of its securities invariable. The reverse must necessarily be the case. The proof of this is very striking in the case now under our consideration [that of the monetary pressure in 1837]. In the published account the variation in the amount of securities held by the Bank is very great; and when we turn to Mr. Palmer's pamphlet to learn how this is to be reconciled with the principle of action professed by the Bank, we are told that to understand this we must look much further than to the published accounts; that we must analyse the nature of the deposits against which the securities are held; and that one class of those deposits being peculiarly of a temporary nature must, on that account, be entirely thrown out of the account, and of course also the securities held against it. By this process a new table of securities is produced which exhibit their amount much more nearly approaching to steadiness.

'But this mode of getting rid of a certain part of the deposits and securities, with a view of obtaining a table which shall exhibit a desired result, is not satisfactory. The deposits in the hands of the Bank, left there by different classes of the community, and arising out of different circumstances, may no doubt differ in respect to their probable permanency and variation of amount, but these are only differences of degree, and make no essential difference upon principle in their nature, or character. They are all equally banking deposits, liable to those variations, in a greater or less degree, which are incidental to such deposits.' (P. 6.)

'To those who are practically acquainted with banking business, or who have reflected on the nature of it, it can hardly be necessary to point out the simple consideration, that banking deposits are necessarily variable in their amount and duration, and that with such variations the amount of securities held by the Bank will also fluctuate. It is therefore unreasonable to talk of the invariable amount of a banker's securities, and this observation is equally applicable to banking business when conducted by the Bank of England, as when it is conducted by any other body.

'On the other hand, I apprehend there will be no difference of opinion amongst those who have reflected on the principles of paper currency as to the soundness of the rule — that the amount of paper issued shall be represented by an amount of securities which never varies, and an amount of specie which is left to fluctuate with the amount of notes out.

'If these views be correct, it follows that the rule now adopted by the Bank is incorrect, and cannot be safely relied upon in the management of the currency. The rule ought to be, that the variations in the amount of circulation shall correspond with the variations in the amount of bullion, and the adherence of the Bank to this rule ought to be obvious on the face of the published accounts. By this means, and by this means only, can we obtain "a paper circulation varying in amount exactly as the circulation would have varied had it been metallic;" and in addition to the establishment of this only sound principle of currency, we shall obtain a simple and intelligible account, requiring no further explanations, nor the production of any information not at the command of the public, to enable them to come to a correct understanding of it.

'Was the management of the currency entrusted to a body established exclusively for that purpose, this is the rule by which such body must govern its operations. It is only by an adherence to such a principle that a paper circulation can be made to vary in amount precisely as the circulation would have varied had it been exclusively metallic. The importance of a rigid adherence to this rule cannot be over-estimated: and if it be incompatible, as is alleged by some, with the mixed functions of the Bank of England, it seems to become a very serious question, whether it is not better to separate altogether the business of banking from that of regulating the currency, rather than suffer an essential rule to be in any degree compromised. It is not, however, very easy to perceive any insuperable difficulty in



rendering the currency department of the Bank of England totally distinct and separate from the management of its other business, so that one should not interfere with or affect the other more than they would do were they under the control of different bodies. In proportion as these two functions are kept distinct, will each be rendered more effectual for its proper purpose. The two branches of the business of the Bank thus divided will proceed with equal efficacy and without mutual interruption; like those animals described by naturalists, whose peculiar property it is that, when cut into two parts, they move off in opposite directions, each half full of life and energy; thus, if the two natures of the Bank of England were completely dissociated, each would proceed to the discharge of its respective functions with more simplicity and efficiency, unencumbered by the conflicting tendencies and opposite action of its former companion.' (P. 9.)

'The principles upon which the two branches ought to be conducted are perfectly distinct, and never can be reduced to one and the same rule. Nothing more sound in principle, nothing more safe in practice, than to invest a certain portion of the proceeds of a national paper currency in fixed securities, and to retain the remaining portion in coin or bullion; taking care that the proportion shall be so fixed, as to leave the bullion sufficient to meet all the usual, and, indeed, all the reasonably possible, fluctuations of amount. On the other hand, the only rule applicable to the management of banking deposits is, that of increasing investment in securities as the deposits increase, and again realising a portion of those securities as the deposits are withdrawn. The two things—the management of a paper currency, and the management of banking deposits—cannot be blended together in one system, and treated as subject to the same laws, and to be governed upon the same principle. The attempt to do so is like that of the unskilful chemist, who attempts to unite together substances which have no affinity and will not combine, and therefore obtains only a confused and useless mixture, where he looked for a perfect chemical compound.' (P. 63.)

It is difficult to conceive how the Directors of the Bank, after having read these passages, could hesitate to adopt for their guidance the views which they presented. Still impervious to reason, and untaught by experience, the Directors adhered to their rule of making their reserve of bullion equally applicable to the payment of the circulation, and to the payment of deposits; all unconscious of the fact, that under the operation of such a rule, the convertibility of the circulation could not be secured.'

That fact, however, was speedily forced on their conviction by irresistible evidence. The crisis of 1837 was succeeded by a favourable exchange and a rapid improvement in the status of the Bank, which was maintained throughout the whole of the year 1838. In 1839, however, a combination of circumstances subjected the Bank to a heavy pressure, and a rapid diminution

of the bullion was the consequence. The extent of the diminution is shown by the following figures, copied from the Gazette returns :—

	Circulation.	Deposits.	Securities.	Bullion.
1839.	£	£	£	£
Jan. 10.	18,207,000	10,315,000	21,680,000	9,336,000
July 1.	18,101,000	7,567,000	23,836,000	4,344,000
Nov. 12.	17,235,000	6,132,000	23,873,000	2,545,000

Such, in 1839, were the results of that amalgamation of functions, under which the reserve of treasure was made equally applicable to the payment of deposits and to the payment of notes. From January to July, deposits were drawn out to the amount of 2,748,000*l.*, and the securities, instead of being partly realised to pay the deposits, as according to the legitimate principles of banking they ought to have been, were increased by 2,154,000*l.*; and while the advances to the public upon securities were thus increased, the amount of the note circulation remained nearly stationary, and the bullion, diverted from its only legitimate purpose, that of securing the convertibility of currency, was diminished by 4,992,000*l.* Nevertheless the Directors of the Bank, unwarned by this rapid exhaustion of their coffers, continued to pay their deposits from their reserve of treasure. In November the deposits were reduced from 10,313,000*l.*—their amount in January—to 6,123,000*l.*; while the securities, instead of undergoing a corresponding diminution, were increased from 21,680,000*l.* to 23,873,000*l.*; and while the bullion was reduced from 9,336,000*l.*—its amount in January—to 2,889,000*l.* The eyes of the Directors were opened. They saw that they had advanced to the verge of a precipice. Desperate circumstances suggest desperate expedients. In her last extremity the Bank of England besought assistance from the Bank of France. A loan of 2,500,000*l.* was generously accorded; we submitted to disgrace, to escape from a recurrence of the overwhelming calamities of 1825.

The conduct of the Bank Directors was denounced not only by the adversaries, but by the advocates of the system under which they acted. Mr. Tooke, the most devout believer in the indissolubility of functions, thus describes the fruits of their union :—

‘The general conclusion, with reference to the management of the Bank, being, that while, *à priori*, the inference is irresistible, that there must be something essentially erroneous in the system, or in the regulation by which, in a period of profound peace, and without any counteraction from the country banks, the Bank of England should have sustained so narrow an escape from a suspension of cash pay-

ments; so it appears, by a reference to particulars, that the measures of the Bank were characterised by anything but a due and vigilant regard for the interests of the public in the maintenance of the convertibility of Bank paper, or for its own credit, which has been much impaired in public estimation, both at home and abroad, by its resort for aid to the bankers of Paris.'

That Mr. Tooke, while thus denouncing the conduct of Bank Directors for perilling the convertibility of the Currency by lowering the rate of interest, and by increasing instead of diminishing their securities as their bullion flowed out, should at the same time have denounced that separation of functions which would have compelled them to secure the convertibility of Currency, by raising the rate of discount and by contracting their advances upon securities as the bullion flowed out, is a striking exemplification of that invincible association of ideas which sees necessary connexion in accidental conjunction, and destroys the power of accurate perception. Fortunately for the stability of our monetary system, the Directors of the Bank of England were not, like Mr. Tooke, so 'enslaved by invincible associations as to close their minds against the lessons of experience. Mr. Norman, the worthy co-labourer with Lord Overstone in the work of monetary reform, had early intimated, that 'the authorities of the Bank 'did not imagine' that a reduction of deposits was equivalent to 'a reduction of the circulation, or that consequently their principle was perfect: they knew its weak point, viz. that it allowed an adverse exchange to be met by a diminution of 'deposits, instead of by a diminution of the circulation; but 'they propounded it because it was the best, the easiest to be 'explained and acted upon, that they could venture to bring 'forward or hope to maintain.' On the narrow escape from a suspension of cash payments in 1839, the majority of the Directors, including the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank, abandoned this imperfect rule, and became zealous converts to the sounder principle of disconnecting the management of deposits from the management of the circulation. In 1844 the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Banks of Issue was appointed for the purpose of investigating this important subject. By a happy selection Sir Charles Wood was appointed to preside; and (to borrow the expressions of a high authority), 'to his unwearied industry, singularly acute 'perception, and sound philosophical views, as Chairman of the 'Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry, the public are mainly 'indebted for the successful conduct of the investigation, and 'for whatever public benefit may result from it.' Sir Robert

Peel was a sedulous member of the Committee, and watched its proceedings with scrutinising attention. Lord Overstone unfolded the true principles upon which a convertible paper currency should be regulated; and dissected with marvellous promptitude and scientific precision the sophistries of objectors. His views were seconded by those of Mr. Norman, one of the earliest and most able propounders of the more advanced principles of monetary science, and were supported and verified by the high authority and practical ability and experience of the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank. The evidence was overwhelming; and Sir Robert Peel, on the arrival of the period at which it became competent for Parliament to revise the Charter of the Bank of England, brought forward, with the generous and cordial approval of the most distinguished men of opposite parties, and with the full acquiescence of the Directors of the Bank, the Bill of 1844, which he justly described as the complement to the Bill of 1819, and as the further step which was necessary to give the public every possible security for the effectual maintenance of metallic payments. The highest praise that can be awarded to a reforming statesman is, that not the slave, but the master of abstract and scientific principles, he subjects them to the limitations and adjustments which may be required to adapt them to actual circumstances and new emergencies. To Sir Robert Peel this highest praise is due. He saw that a strict adherence to scientific principles would require that the whole paper circulation of the country should be issued by a single central department, and that that department should be, not a commercial corporation, but a Government establishment. But at the same time he also saw that there were weighty reasons, administrative and political, against placing the circulation under the direct control of the ministry of the day; and that a sweeping interference with the extensive and long-existing interests of provincial issuers would call forth an amount of resistance which it might be difficult, if not impossible, to overcome. Sir Robert Peel surmounted these obstacles with a sagacity and practical wisdom which is above all praise. He placed the Directors of the Bank as an intervening body—a breakwater—between the commercial community and the Treasury; and instead of suppressing provincial issues, as a strict adherence to principle would have required, he restricted them to a fixed amount, and indemnified the issuers by securing them against rivalry from new establishments. Collision was averted, and opposition disarmed, while the prohibition of new banks of issue held out a certain prospect that the extinction of existing es-

establishments, through failure or voluntary relinquishment, would ultimately secure the scientific completeness of a single central issue.

It cannot be denied that the Act of 1844 has been completely successful in attaining the important object contemplated by its authors,—that of securing the convertibility of the paper circulation. Since it came into operation, the country has not been brought, as in 1825, to within a few hours of a state of barter; neither has a second suspension of cash payments been averted by the disgraceful expedient of resorting to France for a loan of 2,500,000*l*. It carried us through the Irish Famine, requiring, as it did, importations of foreign provisions to the unprecedented amount of 20,000,000*l*. It carried us through the Russian War, while the governments of England, France, and Turkey were pressing into the money market of the world as new competitors for advances to the amount of nearly one hundred millions; and in the critical occurrences of the last few weeks it has, in spite of the clamour of the unreflecting or the interested, established fresh claims on the respect and gratitude of the community. Throughout the whole period of its operation, the commerce of the country has increased with a rapidity unexampled in the history of the world. The weekly returns of the position of the Bank are weekly verifications of the facts that the Act of 1844 has completely succeeded in maintaining an adequate reserve of bullion, and consequently in securing the integrity of our monetary system, through a protracted period of unnatural disturbance in the distribution of the precious metals throughout the world, and of unexampled pressure upon the monetary systems of all the countries of Europe. The monthly returns of trade and navigation have been monthly falsifications of the assertions that the Act has restricted commercial exertion, impaired our financial resources, and arrested the march of England's industrial prosperity.

While Sir Robert Peel's anticipations regarding the practical results of his arrangements have been thus completely realised, his hope that they might allay the agitation of questions affecting the currency was destined to disappointment. His cautious and incomplete adoption of scientific principles, sagacious and politic as it confessedly was, instead of repressing, has prolonged and increased the agitation of such questions. While the real operation of his Act has been to place the department of issue as an independent establishment between the Government and the public, and to make the note circulation a coinage of paper under the sanction of the law, its apparent operation has been to retain the department of issue as part and parcel of the

Bank, and to represent the circulation as still continuing to consist of the promissory notes of a commercial corporation. This has led to the most extraordinary confusion of ideas. Superficial observers have mistaken the apparent for the real operation of the Act. The true character with which, as managers of the circulation, the Bank Directors have been invested, has been lost sight of; and they have been regarded not as public functionaries issuing, on the part of the State, paper money in substitution for the coin of the realm, but as the managers of a banking company putting forth promissory notes on the credit of their own establishment. Hence the absurdity of regarding the reserve of notes in the till of the banking department as a portion of the bullion in the vaults of the department of issue. Hence the equivalent error of denying the character of money to notes passing as legal tenders equally with coin, and of placing them, in common with bills of exchange and other forms of mercantile securities, in the category of credit; and hence the difficulty of distinguishing between the practical effects of creating additional circulation, and of advancing upon discount portions of the circulation already in existence.

It had been our intention to enter at some length upon the Evidence taken before the Committee of last spring on this part of the subject; to refute the fallacies which have originated with Mr. Tooke, and been adopted by Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. J. I. Mill; and to demonstrate that every fluctuation, and every incident to which the circulation is liable under the provisions of the Act of 1844, and the existence of which they urge as an objection to that Act, is a fluctuation and an incident to which an exclusively metallic circulation would be equally liable, and the existence of which, so far from being a valid objection to the Act of 1844, is a verification of the fact, that it has been completely successful in bringing the circulation into strict conformity with its metallic type, and in thus performing the work which it was intended to perform. But the pressure upon the space at our disposal caused by the recent commercial crisis in America and at home, compels us reluctantly to postpone this part of the discussion, and to enter at once upon the causes which we conceive to have a more immediate reference to the recent convulsion.

We turn therefore at once to the consideration of discount banking; and in doing so, we must entreat the indulgence of our readers for entering upon details which, were not the subject of the highest importance, might justly be regarded as tedious and inappropriate. But the subject is of the very

highest importance. Discount banking is the foundation upon which the vast superstructure of our commercial credit rests. Unless we have a distinct perception of the manner in which varying advances from deposits alternately increase and diminish the efficacy of the circulation, and of the process through which an increase or diminution in the efficacy of the circulation causes, by an action on the foreign exchanges, a corresponding diminution or increase in its numerical amount, we cannot obtain an adequate insight into the working of the complex machinery of our monetary system.

It must be abundantly obvious, that under a currency consisting of coin or of mint receipts wholly represented by bullion, there would be a complete separation between the function of issue and the function of discount. The business of the Directors of the Bank of England, and of all other banking establishments throughout the kingdom, would be strictly confined to the management of such portion of the circulation as might be placed at their disposal by their customers. They would receive deposits, pay them upon demand, and advance, at their discretion, a greater or less proportion of them to the public upon interest-bearing securities. Now these several operations, although they could have no direct effect upon the numerical amount of the receipt circulation, would have a very important effect in increasing or diminishing its efficacy, and consequently upon the foreign exchanges.

We take an illustrative case. We assume that on the 7th September, 1844, when the Act came into operation, the receipt circulation out of the walls of the Mint was 28,000,000*l.*; and that the deposits in the Bank of England were 12,000,000*l.*; the advances upon securities 22,000,000*l.*; and the reserve of bullion receipts 8,000,000*l.* It is obvious that had the depositors drawn out 4,000,000*l.* from the Bank and advanced them to the public upon securities, the numerical amount of the circulation out of the walls of the Mint would have remained unaltered. The parties who received the advance would have had a greater command of money by 4,000,000*l.* than before; but then the depositors who made the advance would have had the command of less money than before, by the amount of 4,000,000*l.*

But a very different result would have followed had the Bank Directors advanced from their reserve an additional 4,000,000*l.* upon securities. In this case there would have been no diminution of deposits, and therefore the depositors would have had exactly the same command of money as before; while the parties who had received the advances from the Bank would have had a greater command of money by 4,000,000*l.* than before;

and consequently, although the numerical amount of the currency would have remained the same as before, its efficacy, assuming that the diminution of the reserve caused no abatement of confidence, would have been increased by 4,000,000*l*. But further results would have followed. Should the currency have been previously at par with foreign currencies, it would now have become redundant by 4,000,000*l*. ; its value in relation to foreign currencies would be depreciated, and an adverse exchange would have set in until the presentation of 4,000,000*l*. of the receipt circulation to the Mint, in exchange for bullion for exportation, should have raised the value of the circulation to its foreign par.

The greater part, perhaps even the whole, of the additional advance of 4,000,000*l*., instead of passing into the hands of the public, might have been returned to the Bank as new deposits. But this would have caused no alteration in the final result. The parties who had returned the advances to the Bank as new deposits would have had the same command of money—the same power of effecting purchases and payments, as they could have possessed by retaining the advances in their own keeping. In either case the currency would have been rendered redundant by the amount of the additional advances, until an adverse exchange restored it to par.

As deposits, whether represented by bullion or by book credit, enable their owners, so long as the banks remain solvent, to effect the same amount of purchases and payments as cash actually in hand, the question arises—do they constitute a portion of the circulation? This question was mooted in the Commons' Committee of 1840, on Banks of Issue, and was set at rest by the evidence of Lord Overstone. He said (Q. 3109.) :—

‘Deposit business is a mode of economising the use of the circulation ; by means of resorting to that process, a greater amount of obligations or of transactions can be adjusted, with a smaller amount of circulating medium, than could otherwise take place. The amount of deposits which the Bank of England, or any other bank, holds, is worked by that concern with a certain reserve of bank notes, which reserve is measured in its extent by what that concern considers to be the average quantity of demand that will be made upon it. By that means, that reserve is enabled to perform an amount of business which, without the process of banking deposit business, it would have required an amount of circulation equal to the whole deposits to have performed. By that means, undoubtedly, an economic use of the circulation is effected ; but an economic use of the circulation is not itself circulation. When you put the question,—Are not the bank notes in my till, and the bank notes deposited by me in the Bank of England, equally at my disposal,—it is un-



doubtedly true that they are, but it is true only with respect to the bank notes which I have in the Bank of England, upon the supposition that all persons, similarly situated with myself, do not act simultaneously. The Bank of England, or any other banker, can clearly pay his deposits only to the extent of the banking reserve in his till. The banking reserve in his till is the money with which that business is worked, and constitutes the amount of circulation. It is to mistake the amount of business done for the instrument with which it is done, to call deposits circulation. Deposits are the business worked; the reserve in the banking till is the instrument with which they are worked.'

Thus we have a clear and broad line of demarcation between circulation and deposits. It is a vague and figurative form of expression to say, that depositors have money in the Bank. In strictness of language, they have nothing in the Bank but credit entries in its books. When a depositor pays into the Bank a note for a thousand pounds, the Bank acquires absolute possession of the note, readvances it wholly or in part to the public, and gives to the depositor, in exchange for it, an authority to draw out a thousand pounds from the notes previously existing in its till. Now it is the portion of the circulation previously existing in the till of the Bank, and not the credit entry in its books, which confers upon the depositor the power of effecting purchases and payments, to the amount of a thousand pounds. Take away the portion of the circulation previously existing as the Bank reserve, and the depositor's credit entry becomes as worthless as the scrap of paper upon which it is written. The portion of the circulation in the till of the Bank may be regarded as a constituent body, the credits in its books as an assemblage of delegates. Abolish the constituent body, and the delegates are transformed into men of straw.

Some economists, amongst whom Mr. James Wilson is the most prominent, have fallen into the extraordinary fallacy of excluding banking reserves from the active circulation. Lord Overstone has triumphantly disposed of this fallacy by showing, that banking reserves, so far from being inactive, are beyond all comparison the most efficacious portion of the circulation. They are the economising instruments which sustain the efficacy of the vast mass of book credits, and convert them into a species of auxiliary or delegate money. Banking reserves, besides, have the power of imparting monetary efficacy to an indefinite amount of book credits,—a power which would be altogether without limit, were it not controlled by the counteraction of the foreign exchanges. The nature of this counteraction admits of the clearest explanation. When the aggregate amount of

circulation and of book credits exceeds that amount of circulation which could be maintained under the law of monetary equilibrium. Were there no book credits in existence, then, an adverse exchange sets in, and banking reserves are drawn out to be exchanged for gold for exportation, until the equilibrium is restored. Whatever may be the amount of circulation which, were there no discount banking, would be required to keep the currency at its foreign par, to that same amount the aggregate amount of circulation and of economical expedients, after every temporary deviation, necessarily conforms. For example: should it require, in the absence of deposit and discount banking, a circulation of 24,000,000*l.* out of the issuing body to maintain the currency at par, the aggregate amount of banking reserves, of book credits not represented by cash, and of notes in the hands of the public, could not permanently exceed 24,000,000*l.* Were the aggregate amount, through a diminution of book credits, to fall short of 24,000,000*l.*, a favourable exchange would supply the deficiency; and were it to exceed 24,000,000*l.* through an increase of credits, an adverse exchange would carry off the excess.

We proceed to consider the nature and extent — 1st, of the advantages resulting from discount banking; and, 2nd, of the occasional disasters by which these advantages are counterpoised.

The advantages derived from discount banking consist in the economy effected by substituting auxiliary for actual money. The money placed at the disposal of bankers is entered in their books to the credit of the depositors; the bankers retain one portion of it as their cash reserves, and advance the other and the larger portion of it on securities. The credit entries, so long as the banks remain solvent, give to the depositors the same command of money which they would possess were the whole of the deposits represented by cash in the coffers of the banks, and consequently that portion of the money deposited with the bankers which is advanced by them upon securities, is disengaged from circulation, and made applicable to the purchase of additional supplies of food, materials, and implements.

The advantage derived from discount banking is subject to considerable variations. It is increased or diminished with every increase or diminution in the number of those who adopt the practice of placing their money in the banks, and also with every increase or diminution in the proportion which bankers may find it expedient to maintain between the amount of their advances upon securities and their reserves.

The operations of discount banking have a considerable effect in increasing the activity of the circulation. They impart to it

an elasticity which enables any given sum to perform many functions in rapid succession. A country banker, for example, makes advances to the farmers on the approach of their rent day; the farmers pay these advances to their landlord; and the landlord returns them to the banker as renewed deposits. But this is not all. The rent day may fall at a time when the farmers find it necessary to employ an additional number of labourers; and the bankers may re-advance to them the amount of the rent deposited by the landlord; the farmers may advance it as wages to the labourers, who spend it as fast as received with the retail dealers, who pay it to their credit with the bank. Thus the sums withdrawn by the banker from his cash reserves to meet the temporary demands of the farmers, may, after having performed these several functions, be returned into his coffers before the expiration of a month from the date of the first advance.

Discount banking economises capital. In other words, it enables producers to devote to direct production capital which they would otherwise be obliged to retain in the form of money to meet their coming payments. A manufacturer expends 1000*l.* a-week in wages, and sells his goods to the merchants at three months' credit. Were he to wait for the replacement of his advances, until the bills of the merchants should fall due, he would be obliged, on commencing business, to provide for his payments on account of wages alone, by locking up capital to the amount of 12,000*l.* and upwards. But he can provide for his weekly payments to his operatives by discounting from time to time the acceptances of the purchasers of his goods, and he may be thus enabled to carry on his business with a cash reserve on account of wages of 4000*l.* or 5000*l.*

The effect of discount banking in economising mercantile capital is still more striking. Under the credit system the purchases of the merchant may be effected without any immediate money payment whatever. He purchases by giving, and sells by taking, bills payable on a future day; and should he so arrange his transactions as to be able to discount the bills he has received just as those which he has granted are falling due, he may carry on an immense amount of business while holding a very insignificant portion of his capital under the form of a cash reserve.

The economy of capital effected by our extensive system of discount banking, gives to the manufacturers and merchants of this country some important advantages over their foreign competitors. The proportion of his whole capital, which a manufacturer or a merchant finds it necessary to hold under the form of a cash reserve, is less in England than in any other

country in the world. Whatever may be the proportion in which cash reserves can be safely reduced, in that same proportion the cost of production and the cost of distribution will also be reduced, and in that same proportion, even should other productive elements be equal, England will be able to maintain her superiority in foreign markets. But other productive elements are not equal. In the fertility of her soil, in the juxtaposition of her coal and iron, in the extent of her sea coast indented by harbours, in her canals and her network of railways, and above all in the persevering energy of her working classes, England is without a rival. And it cannot be doubted that the economy of capital, effected by her extensive system of discount banking, enables her to call out into fuller activity these various sources of industrial prosperity.

These decisive advantages necessarily involve some degree of insecurity. The merchant who extends his operations by diminishing his cash reserve, and trusts to discounts for meeting his enlarged engagements, realises increased profit by incurring increased risk. Commerce becomes more hazardous as credit is substituted for cash. As an increase in the efficacy of the circulation, caused by advances from deposits, has the same effect upon the markets as an increase in the numerical amount of the circulation, so a withdrawal of deposits has an effect upon the markets identical with that which results from a diminution in the amount of the circulation. Hence as the system of discount banking extends, the stability of trade becomes more and more dependent on the character of bankers, and in the soundness of the principles on which they conduct their business. When they conform to the rules of legitimate banking—when they make their advances upon none but immediately available securities—and, above all, when they resolutely maintain a due proportion between their reserves and their advances, they confer upon the country the most important advantages.

On the other hand, when bankers depart from the rules of legitimate banking, when they endanger their own stability and the security of the funds entrusted to their keeping by failing to maintain a due proportion between their reserves and their advances—when they make their advances on securities not immediately available—when they speculate in the public funds or in commodities—and, above all, when, disregarding the foreign exchanges, they cause the aggregate amount of currency, and of auxiliary money represented by book credits, to exceed the amount at which the law of equilibrium would maintain the circulation were banks of discount non-existing,—when bankers thus abandon their duty to themselves and to the public, they

inflict upon the country the most serious injury, render more sudden and severe that contraction of the circulation and of credit incident upon a protracted drain of bullion, intensify pressure into panic, and excite a temporary doubt whether the advantages of discount banking, even when conducted under a metallic currency, balance the evils it inflicts.

This doubt recent disclosures fearfully increase. Measured by the extent of the widespread ruin it has wrought, the conduct of the directors of the Royal British Bank, and of the Eastern Bank of London, must be regarded as scarcely less criminal than the forgeries and frauds for which Fauntleroy was hanged, and Sir John Paul transported. The conduct of the managers of the Borough Bank of Liverpool, and of the Western Bank of Scotland was less criminal, but who will say in what degree? The principles and rules of discount banking are fully understood, and are, by all bankers worthy of the name, strictly acted on. These rules are: that bankers shall be remunerated by advancing upon interest a portion of the money entrusted to their keeping; that the other portion which they retain in their coffers, shall be maintained at an amount sufficient to pay at call all the expected and probable demands of their depositors; and that, as a further security to their depositors, the portion of their money employed as banking capital shall be advanced only for short periods, and upon available securities. It is upon the implied condition, the expectation, and the trust that these principles shall be duly acted upon, that money is deposited in banks. The banker who deliberately departs from them violates an implied contract, and commits a breach of trust. When he has departed from them to an extent which compels him to stop payment—when his deposits have been lost—when he has reduced hundreds to penury, and has thrown thousands out of employment—is he to be held guiltless? Are the scales of justice held even, when a petty thief, or the forger of a five-pound note, is treated as a felon, and when the speculating banker, who, by such violations of implied contracts, and by breaches of trust, has appropriated to his own use the money of his customers—to the amount of hundreds of thousands—obtains from the Court of Bankruptcy a full liquidation of his debts, and receives from sympathising friends and half-ruined creditors the means of recommencing his disreputable and mischievous career? Should the scales of justice continue to be so held, the perpetrator of petty frauds may, with little exaggeration, appropriate the crime-consoling song of Macheath in the ‘Beggars’ Opera’ :—

' Since laws were made in every degree,  
To check vice in others as well as in me,  
I wonder w' have not better company  
Upon Tyburn tree.

' But gold from laws can take out the sting,  
And if rich men like me were to swing,  
It would thin the land, so many would string  
Upon Tyburn tree.'

The influence of discount banking for good or for evil has very considerably increased during the last few years, and appears to be still increasing. In the metropolis in particular joint stock banks, discount houses, and bill brokers have multiplied. The practice which these numerous establishments have introduced of allowing interest upon deposits draws into their coffers the spare cash of the whole community. No money beyond that which may be required for the daily and weekly payments of the retail markets is suffered to be unemployed. All classes above the lowest are more or less interested in the discount market, and London may be regarded as one vast discount establishment. That this is a state of things pregnant with danger is obvious at a glance. The stability of discount banking is measured by the proportion maintained between reserves and deposits. But when discount houses allow a high rate of interest upon deposits they cannot afford to retain any considerable portion of them unemployed as reserves yielding no interest. Hence, under the existing practice, an advance in the rate of discounts, while it may restrain over-trading in merchants incites it in money lenders. The higher the rate of discount the higher the rate allowed upon deposits, and the higher the rate allowed upon deposits the greater the loss upon reserves, and the greater the temptation to make advances upon insufficient securities. The proportion of deposits represented by cash diminishes, while the portion represented by book credits increases. Reserves become so much reduced that a slight withdrawal of the money placed at call involves the discount houses in difficulties, and sends them to the Bank of England to have the bills upon which they made advances rediscounted. But while these additional demands are made upon the Bank its own resources undergo diminution from the extension of book credits, and the consequent diminution of the circulation. It cannot be too often repeated that the aggregate amount of the portion of the circulation in the hands of the public, of reserves, and of book credits, cannot permanently exceed the amount at which the circulation would stand were discount banking non-existent; and that every extension of auxiliary

money under the form of book credits must sooner or later be accompanied by a corresponding diminution in the amount of the circulation out of the walls of the issuing body, whether it consist of coin or of convertible paper. In whatever proportion the extension of discount banking increases the efficacy of the circulation, in the same proportion it diminishes its numerical amount, reduces reserves, drives out the bullion, and perils the stability of our monetary system by causing it to rest on a narrower metallic base.

Additional advances from deposits produce effects upon prices, upon commercial credit and upon the exchanges, results analogous to those produced by additional issues of bank notes. An additional issue of one million of bank notes increases the numerical amount of the circulation by one million—an additional advance of one million from deposits increases its efficacy by one million. In either case, the exchanges being previously at par, the circulation is redundant by one million, its value depreciated in relation to foreign currencies; and in either case one million of gold is gradually exported to restore the monetary equilibrium. \* Go on increasing the issue of notes million by million and the gold will flow out until the reserves of treasure are exhausted, and metallic payments suspended. Go on increasing advances from deposits million by million, and the gold and the circulation represented by it will be expelled million by million until banking reserves are exhausted, and the auxiliary money to which they had imparted value is extinguished. In the former case the note circulation would remain, and the governing authorities might afford timely relief by declaring it to be a legal tender. In the latter case nothing would remain but credit entries in the books of insolvent banks. Universal insolvency and a state of barter would be the final results.

Thus we see that even under a currency exclusively metallic, over-banking and the insolvency of discount-houses may occasion disasters as formidable as those which can result from an unrestricted issue of bank notes and a suspension of cash payments.

The character of a crisis originating in undue advances from deposits is altogether different from that of a crisis originating in undue issues of bank notes. In the former case the circulation is unduly diminished, while the book credits are unduly increased; in the latter the circulation is unduly increased while the bullion is unduly diminished. In the former case deposits are endangered, in the latter convertibility is endangered. These dissimilar dangers require dissimilar remedies. When an excessive issue of bank notes begins to threaten an

exhaustion of the bullion and a suspension of specie payments, the appropriate and effectual remedy is to cause the note circulation to contract as the bullion is diminished. When a reckless extension of discounts begins to threaten the exhaustion of reserves and the extinction of deposits, the appropriate and effectual remedy is to cause the auxiliary currency consisting of book credits to diminish, and the portion of the circulation retained as banking reserves to increase. But whether a monetary crisis originate in an excessive issue of convertible paper, or in an excessive issue of advances from deposits, it may, if suffered to proceed unchecked, end in a panic. From panics threatening exhaustion of bullion and suspension of cash payments we are effectually protected by the Act of 1844. To panics threatening exhaustion of banking reserves, loss of deposits, and the extension of auxiliary currency, we continue to be liable. It is therefore most important, as regards practical results, that we should have an accurate knowledge of their origin and character, and of the means by which they may be less frequent and less intense.

When there is a diminution in the ordinary supply of leading articles of consumption, their prices rise; and should the rise of prices be proportionate to the diminution in the supply, the whole of the diminished quantity will be purchased by consumers at the advanced prices. In such cases, however, it invariably happens that prices rise in a greater proportion than that in which supplies are diminished; and consequently the whole of the diminished supplies cannot be purchased, unless there should be a simultaneous increase in the money incomes of consumers. But, as has been already shown, a rise of prices, originating in a diminution in the quantity of commodities, instead of increasing, diminishes the money incomes of consumers. As prices rise, imports increase; and the money paid by the consumers to dealers for the increased imports the dealers transfer to importing merchants, who remit it to their foreign correspondents in payment for the imported goods. Thus a portion of the money incomes which consumers had previously paid to dealers for domestic goods, which the dealers had paid to domestic producers, and which domestic producers had distributed in the form of wages and profits, is transferred to the foreign producer. And thus in whatever proportion a rise of prices, from diminished supplies of domestic productions, may cause an increase of imports, in that same proportion it diminishes money incomes, as represented by wages and profits, and contributes to render it impossible to resell to consumers the whole of the diminished stocks at the increased prices at



which the dealers had purchased them. This constitutes the first stage of a monetary and commercial pressure. It would quickly terminate were there no banks of discount. In this case dealers would be compelled to bring their stocks into the retail markets at reduced prices, in order to obtain cash to meet their acceptances to the merchants, who in their turn would be compelled to reduce wholesale prices in order to meet their acceptances to the producers. The supply of goods, augmented as it had been by diminished consumption and increased importation, would now exceed the ordinary demand in a greater proportion than it had at first fallen short of it; and as the money incomes of consumers had been reduced, a fall of prices considerably below the ordinary level would be the inevitable result. When prices fell below that level, a readjustment would commence. Increased consumption would reduce the redundant stocks, while diminished imports and increased exports would bring back the gold which the advance of prices had expelled.

Very different results are produced under a system of discount banking. In this case speculative purchasers upon credit, instead of being obliged to provide for their coming engagements, by resales at reduced prices, discount the bills they have received before those they have granted fall due. There is no fall of prices, no commercial failures. The early speculators, who had effected purchases before the advance of prices, would be enabled to realise unusual profits by resales; and new adventurers would be eager to purchase in a rising market. Instead of distrust, collapse, and insolvency, there would be increased confidence, extended transactions, and successful adventure. It is abundantly evident that amidst this apparent prosperity the causes of disaster would be increased. The artificial stinting of the retail market would be greater than before. Prices would continue to rise, importation to increase, gold to flow out, wages and profits to decline, retail purchasers of domestic productions to diminish, and the stocks in the hands of retailers and merchants to increase. Thus the ultimate results of the advances from the banks would be an accumulation of the stocks purchased upon credit, and an amount of bills under discount beyond the amount which could be realised by the resale of these stocks at prices which consumers had ability to pay.

In such an inflated state of the market nothing, save additional advances from the banks could avert collapse. Should the bankers understand and conform to the legitimate principles of banking—should they take warning from the adverse exchange, and limit their advances as their reserves declined, the failure of the houses which had incurred liabilities beyond the

amount which their assets could be made to realise, would speedily terminate the speculative excitement, and restore the markets to their normal state.

But, on the other hand, should the managers of banking establishments be imperfectly acquainted with the laws of monetary distribution, in conformity with which discount banking ought to be conducted — should they omit to observe the action of the exchanges on their reserves, and to recognise the fact, that a speculative withholding of commodities from market has, while it lasts, the same effect as an actual diminution in the quantity of commodities, in diminishing our share of the money of the world — should they confine their attention to immediate results, and fail to take a comprehensive view of the ultimate and inevitable consequences of raising prices above the scale at which stocks can be resold to consumers — should the managers of banking establishments thus abandon the duties of their high calling, they might yield to the importunity of their customers, and consent to uphold the inflation of the markets by granting renewed and increased advances. In this case temporary relief would be obtained at the cost of increased embarrassment. The inevitable results of the extended accommodation would be still higher prices, heavier stocks, increased importations, continued abstraction of bullion, a further decline in money incomes, with a further increase in the amount of bills under discount, and a further diminution in the means of providing for them when due by resales to consumers. Each additional advance would create, as it fell due, a demand for another of still greater amount; and each additional demand, if complied with, would cause a still further diminution of reserves.

The weaker establishments might seek to replenish their coffers by adopting the vicious expedient of re-discounting the bills upon which their advance had been made; and this losing game might cause a temporary increase of reserves until the payment of the bills endorsed to the re-discounters reduced them by the rate of interest below the amount at which they would have stood had the bills been retained until they arrived at maturity. No possible, no conceivable expedient could keep up a continuous expansion of credit. Every attempt to do so would cause the amount of the outstanding bills, by which wholesale purchases of goods had been effected, to exceed by a greater proportion than before the amount which could be realised by the resale of the goods to consumers. The inevitable crash would be more destructive the longer it should be delayed. The more intelligent and prescient bankers begin to limit their advances; the speculative dealers, the amount of whose out-

standing engagements exceeds in the largest proportion the amounts which their stocks can be made to realise, stop payment. The less prudent bankers, who hold their dishonoured acceptances, fail. Their failure excites alarm, and depositors withdraw their cash from the yet solvent banks. The sources of discount banking are dried up, and the auxiliary currency, consisting of book credits, which some authorities have erroneously placed in the category of money, become utterly worthless. Panic walks abroad. Stocks become unsaleable, production is suspended, multitudes are thrown out of employment, and poverty and destitution prevail to a lamentable and dangerous extent.

Such is the character, and such has sometimes been the extent, of the mischief which excessive advances from deposits may occasion under a currency consisting of coin, or of paper wholly represented by bullion. Under a strange misconception and confusion of ideas, the opponents of the Act of 1844 assume that it has failed to fulfil the purpose for which it was intended, because it has failed to avert commercial disaster, which, whether the circulation consist of coin or of paper, excess in discount banking necessarily inflicts. The assumption is directly opposite to fact. It was no purpose of the Act to regulate discount operations. Its avowed objects were — to regulate the currency on the principle of metallic variation; to secure its convertibility, and to abstain altogether from interfering with banking operations. That these were the objects of the Act was repeatedly affirmed by its authors, and was distinctly and emphatically announced in the publications of Lord Overstone, and in the speeches of Sir Robert Peel, and of Sir Charles Wood. And that these objects have been fully obtained is patent to the public. The circulation has varied as a metallic circulation would have varied; its convertibility has been secured under the severest trials, and the business of banking, properly so called, has not been in any way interfered with or disturbed under the provisions of the Act. The Act has done what it was intended to do; and it is a manifest and glaring absurdity to charge it with failure for not having done what it was intended not to do. Had the currency consisted of coin, or of Mint receipts for bullion, in actual deposit, no one would have ventured to utter the absurdity that the Mint had failed to perform its functions because reckless speculators had made purchases upon credit at prices exceeding those which resales to consumers could realise. Nevertheless, from some unaccountable incapacity to perceive the phenomena of the markets as they actually exist, the opponents of the Act of 1844 affirm the

equivalent absurdity, that it has failed to perform its appropriate functions, as often as the amount of the circulation, while varying under its provisions, as a metallic circulation would vary, becomes insufficient to replenish the reserves of over-trading banks, and to enable over-sanguine speculators to realise sales at prices which consumers are unable to pay.

But although it was no purpose of the Act of 1844 to correct the evils consequent upon undue extension of banking accommodation, it has, through its indirect operation, facilitated their correction. Previous to the separation of the functions of issue and of discount it was difficult, if not wholly impossible, to ascertain how much of the evils of a monetary panic might be due to excessive issues of notes, and how much to excessive advances from deposits. Since the separation, this difficulty has been removed. The weekly returns of the respective departments tell us at a glance whether the issues are so regulated under the action of the exchanges as to secure us against panic from an exhaustion of the bullion; and whether the advances from deposits are so adjusted as to secure us against panic from an exhaustion of the reserve.

It has been made evident that when convertibility is secured by regulating the circulation in conformity with the variation of the bullion, there can be no serious commercial pressure unless extensive purchases upon credit should have been effected at prices higher than those which the money incomes of consumers enable them to pay; and it is equally evident that credit purchases at higher prices than consumers have ability to pay, must be speedily discontinued unless bankers should aid the speculative holders of stocks by undue and hazardous advances from deposits. Thus the separation of functions gives us a clearer insight into the nature and possible extent of the mischief of which over-banking is the single and exclusive cause; and this more accurate knowledge of the cause of the mischief gives us a surer indication of the appropriate remedy. Were there no over-banking, there could not be (except for brief periods) over-trading and excessive speculation. Correct our vicious banking system, and the visitation of speculative excitement and subsequent collapse will be few and far between.

But so long as the legitimate principles of banking may continue to be set at naught, excessive speculation, revulsion, and panic will occasionally occur; and the problem how panics should be dealt with will demand the serious consideration of Government and Parliament. It is obvious that when an unreasoning panic has once set in, it must be promptly dealt with by the executive authority. When thousands are sinking

into poverty, and hundreds of thousands are thrown out of employment, and cast in destitution on the world, there is no time for legislation. As it was long ago distinctly stated by Mr. Huskisson, as it was reiterated by Lord Overstone in his letter to Mr. J. B. Smith, as it was prominently avowed by Sir Charles Wood in his place in the House of Commons,—a sudden and unforeseen calamity affecting large masses of the community must be encountered on the instant by the Government of the day, upon its own responsibility, and subject to the future award of Parliament. No pre-enactment can prescribe an appropriate remedy for an unknown contingency. Each successive emergency may differ from those which preceded it, and may consequently require to be differently dealt with. Exceptional cases cannot be brought under general rules.

While it devolves on the executive authority to encounter sudden and unforeseen emergencies on the instant of their occurrence, it is the province of Parliament to deal prospectively with the known and permanent causes of which such emergencies are the effects. Legislation may avert the effect by removing the cause. Parliament may render revulsion and panics less frequent and less intense, by mitigating the vicious excesses of our banking system. To this salutary reform, although there is no theoretical, yet there is a serious practical difficulty opposed. Science says, let provincial issues and one-pound notes be abolished. Caution answers, ignorance, prejudice, and self-interest are opponents to reform, which it would be difficult to overcome. Sir Robert Peel listened to caution, and abstained from suppressing country issues and Scotch one-pound notes. But in spite of the opinions proclaimed by noblemen and gentlemen at a recent meeting in support of the banking interest of Scotland, we trust that we shall not have to pass through another decade of commercial pressure, revulsion, and panic before public opinion shall be sufficiently enlightened to enable Ministers to regulate the currency in accordance with the true principles of monetary science. It is impossible that the people of England should always submit to lend the support of their sound metallic currency to rescue the northern part of this island from the consequences of its stubborn resistance to truths and facts which science has ascertained and experience demonstrated; and that the restrictions which the Bank of England has adopted should be relaxed in favour of the adventurous operations of joint-stock discount houses and Scotch banks. Some not unimportant improvements might at once be effected. Great public advantage has re-

sulted from the publication of the weekly returns of the Bank of England, and it may reasonably be expected that analogous advantages would be derived from extending the principle of publicity to all the other joint-stock banking companies in the kingdom. It cannot be doubted, we think, that a weekly notification of the amount of the deposits, securities, and reserves in all the joint-stock banks throughout the country would operate as a powerful corrective of that reckless extension of discounts and hazardous diminution of reserves which have been among the most powerful causes of the recent collapse of credit. Other regulations conducive to similar results might be adopted. But we will not enter into fuller detail. Our main purpose is not to suggest measures either for the mitigation or for the prevention of panic, but rather to indicate the principle upon which it is essential that all such measures should proceed. That principle is simply this—to abstain from every device the adoption of which would tend to facilitate over-banking. Some authorities of high pretension not only disregard this essential principle, but adopt a principle directly opposed to it. They would relieve commercial pressure by giving increased facilities to over-banking. They would mitigate the distressing symptoms of the hour by prolonging and aggravating the cause of the disease. A striking exemplification of this is presented in the evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee of last session by Mr. D. B. Chapman, the managing partner of the house of Overend and Gurney. He says:—

‘I think that though the Bank of England notes in reserve may have fallen to a certain amount below which the Bank hardly ought not to go as bankers: yet if they are applied to by the public for the supply of the commercial world upon undoubted bills, not only in point of security, but of a purely commercial character, such as the very first class bills, they ought to have power to discount them under any circumstances whatever; I think that provision should be made for that, and that then any idea of locking up money from panic would be perfectly laughed at,—it would be absurd. The question of suffering from a high rate of interest would be another thing; those dealing in money would have to suffer that, but that the public should be in danger of a convulsion by the impossibility of discounting the acceptances of Messrs. Coutts and Co., the Treasury, Messrs. Jones Loyd, Messrs. Smith Payne, and the first concerns in the world, should be provided against.’

‘I would empower the Bank of England to extend their issues under certain circumstances, but not entirely for their own benefit; I would give them the power to extend the circulating medium at a given rate of interest, so as to make it difficult for the people to

apply for it beyond what necessity should require; but for undoubted securities of a legitimate character the circulating medium should be always obtainable.'

We would request this experienced observer of the monetary movements between Lombard Street and the Bank to extend his views to the monetary movements of the world. We would venture to remind him that the circumstances under which the demand for money in Lombard Street is increased are the same identical circumstances under which our share of the money of the world is diminished. A diminution in the usual supply of commodities raises prices, speculators rush into the market and effect extensive purchases upon credit in expectation of a further rise. As the customary periods of credit expire, the speculators, instead of providing for their engagements by resales, hold back their stocks and apply for discount. But while the demand for money is thus increased, the supply is diminished. The high prices invite imports and arrest exports, the exchange becomes adverse, and the gold flows out. Mr. Chapman's proposal, that the Bank shall provide circulating medium sufficient to supply all the demands of all the holders of legitimate commercial bills, amounts simply to this—that our monetary laws shall be made to counteract and to overrule the natural law of equilibrium which determines the amount of the circulation which it is possible for the country to maintain. Surely Mr. Chapman must see, upon reconsideration, that he has proposed a remedy against monetary pressure which it would be physically impossible to carry out, and which, could it be carried out, would give increased inducements to excessive speculation, and thus aggravate the evils it was intended to avert. His proposed fence of a minimum rate of discount of 10 per cent. would be altogether ineffectual. A charge of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. for the use of money for three months would not arrest the operations of the speculators who might expect to realise 20 or 30 per cent. upon a rise of prices.

It is wonderful with how small an amount of monetary science the vast amounts of our commercial transactions are conducted. Credit is a purchasing, but not a paying power: the paying power is the money income of consumers. Over-trading is purchasing upon credit at prices above those which, under the actual scale of money incomes, resales to consumers can realise. Such over-trading could not be maintained except for the briefest periods, unless it should be sustained by undue advances from banks and discount houses. So long as bankers and money-lenders discount the bills of speculative traders who have made purchases upon credit at prices which resales to consumers can-

not replace, so long will each successive advance create a demand for another of greater amount, until reserves verge to exhaustion, and until bankers and discounters require for themselves the assistance they had too lavishly accorded to their customers. These propositions are so obvious, are so consonant to daily experience, and we might almost say are so self-evident, that their bare enunciation commands assent. Nevertheless, Mr. Chapman, although engaged for half a century in conducting the business of one of the largest discount establishments in the world, appears to have no comprehension of the law of monetary equilibrium which determines the limits beyond which the business of discount cannot, without inducing revulsions and discredit, be permitted to pass. He does not see that in urging upon the Parliamentary Committee the double necessity of maintaining an adequate reserve of gold, and of keeping up a supply of convertible notes, to meet the demands of the holders of all the legitimate bills which might be presented for discount, he was recommending measures, the adoption of either of which would be destructive of the other. If an adequate reserve of gold is to be maintained, discounts must be limited by the law of equilibrium; if the Bank is to make advances upon all the legitimate mercantile securities which in periods of speculative excitement may be presented for discount, cash payments must be suspended.

It is only in minds of the highest order that practical and speculative ability are conjoined. In the great majority of instances it will be found that the man of business, however able and successful, is deficient in scientific attainments, and that the man of science, however profound and original, is unable to bring into practical operation even such theoretical truths as he may have himself discovered. Under the intellectual division of employment some particular faculty receives in each individual undue development, and, like Aaron's serpent, 'swallows up the rest.' Mental vision, when habitually directed to the examination of any particular field of thought, becomes microscopic. It can 'inspect a mite, not comprehend a heaven.' Those who are too exclusively occupied by practical details gradually lose the power of generalisation and induction. They may have a clear and accurate perception of isolated facts, but they can neither comprehend their causes nor trace their effects. The object immediately before them assumes a magnitude which shuts out the surrounding prospect from their view. They may be useful servants, but they are unsafe guides.

The correctness of these remarks receives a striking verification in the extraordinary extent to which errors in monetary



science permeate the writings of those who deal most largely in monetary statistics. The juxtaposition of elaborate statistics and contradictory conclusions is peculiarly and conspicuously exemplified in the writings of Mr. Tooke, Mr. Newmarsh, and Mr. Wilson. We present a few specimens.

These statistical economists avow themselves to be uncompromising advocates of free trade, and determined opponents of restrictions on imports and of bounties upon exports, while with unparalleled inconsistency they would give a bounty upon the importation of gold under a favourable exchange, and encourage its exportation under an adverse exchange. The merit of this glaring violation of the principle of free trade is mainly due to Mr. Tooke. His scheme is to keep the bank rate of discount above the market rate during an influx of gold, in order to give the importer an artificial inducement to continue the importation until the treasure in the Bank amounts to 15,000,000*l.*; and, on the other hand, to keep the Bank rate below the market rate during an efflux of gold, in order to afford the exporter an artificial inducement to prolong the exportation until the treasure in the Bank shall have sunk to 5,000,000*l.*

This precious device violates the principle of free trade in three several ways: 1st. By alternately extending artificial encouragement to the importation and exportation of gold; 2nd. By artificial interference with the rate of discount; 3rd. By unduly arresting commercial enterprise by means of a forced elevation of the rate of interest when capital is abundant and gold flowing in, and by unduly exciting reckless speculation through a forced depression of the rate of discount when capital is deficient and gold flowing out.

Another remedy against the distrust and panic consequent upon over-banking and over-trading is, to engraft upon the Act of 1844 a discretionary relaxing power. The adoption of this remedy is thus cautiously proposed in the Report of the Lords' Committee of 1848:—'The principle upon which the Act of 1844 should be amended is the introduction of a discretionary relaxing power: such power, in whomsoever vested, to be exercised only during the existence of a favourable exchange.' It is fully admitted in the Report that the relaxing power could not be exercised during an adverse exchange without leading to a suspension of cash payments. Gold is exported because the proportion of currency to commodities is greater in this than in foreign countries; and it is self-evident that the relative redundancy of the currency, and the consequent exportation of gold, would be continued and increased so long as the exercise of a relaxing power should increase the note circulation issued

against securities. The inevitable result of a relaxing power under an adverse exchange would be an exhaustion of the bullion and a suspension of metallic payments.

Fully aware that a discretionary relaxing power would peril the convertibility of the currency were it exercised during an adverse exchange, the Lords' Committee would restrict its exercise to periods of favourable exchange, accompanied by domestic alarm and hoarding. Now, domestic alarm and hoarding may originate either in a low state of the bullion, threatening a suspension of cash payments; or in a low state of the banking reserves, threatening a contraction of discounts, and endangering deposits. In the former case there is a rush for gold; in the latter there is a withdrawal and hoarding of deposits. In either case the effect of a discretionary relaxing power would be, not to mitigate, but, on the contrary, to prolong and intensify, the monetary derangement.

In the case of domestic distrust and alarm, originating in a low state of the bullion, and causing a rush for gold, the cause of the danger has past as soon as a favourable exchange sets in. At this critical change recovery commences, and all that is necessary to secure its completion is that the law of monetary equilibrium should be allowed to operate without counteraction. Now, a brief consideration will be sufficient to convince us that this process of rectification would be completely counteracted, were the law of monetary equilibrium superseded, by engrafting on the Act of 1844 a discretionary power of relaxation. Let us take a case in which the active portion of the circulation is being reduced by alarm and hoarding below the par level, at the rate of 100,000*l.* per week. Should the law of metallic equilibrium be left to act unchecked, a weekly influx of gold to the amount of 100,000*l.* would supply the place of the notes withdrawn from circulation, gradually allay alarm, arrest hoarding, and finally place the currency on a wider metallic basis. On the other hand, should the law of equilibrium be suspended by the proposed relaxing power, the notes withdrawn from circulation would be replaced by additional issues instead of by gold, the amount of the circulation would remain as before, and the final result would be an increase in the proportion consisting of paper, with a corresponding diminution in the portion consisting of gold. The extent of the temporary relief offered to trade would be exactly the same in the two cases; the difference would be, that in the latter case the temporary relief would have been obtained by the incurring of future danger. It will be evident at a glance that in a case of a domestic drain, accompanied by a favourable foreign exchange, a relaxing

power could not by possibility afford any greater relief than that which could be equally afforded under the law of monetary equilibrium, unless the amount of the additional issue of notes should exceed the amount of the gold which the favourable exchange might bring in. But should the amount of the additional notes exceed that of the gold which the law of equilibrium brought in, the circulation would be increased beyond the par level, and not only would the return of gold from a favourable exchange be prevented, but an adverse exchange would again set in; and a renewed and protracted drain for exportation, acting in conjunction with the previous domestic drain, would aggravate in an indefinite degree the alarm, the discredit, the hoarding, and the panic sought to be relieved.

We turn to the case of distrust and alarm originating in a low state of banking reserves, and causing the withdrawal and hoarding of deposits. Here the appropriate remedy is to increase the banking reserves. When these reserves are believed to bear a safe proportion to deposits confidence is high, and the circulation active. And, on the other hand, when banking reserves are supposed to bear too low a proportion to liabilities, confidence declines, and the efficacy of the circulation is diminished by alarm and hoarding; so that an increase in the numerical amount of the advances to the public, when made by an undue diminution of banking reserves, becomes of itself a cause of monetary pressure. The efficacy of the circulation is diminished in a greater proportion than its numerical amount is increased; and thus, paradoxical as it may appear to those who do not look below the surface, money is scarce because it is abundant. The above considerations will render it apparent that the safety or the danger of engrafting a discretionary relaxing power upon the Act of 1844 must mainly depend upon the effect which the existence of such a power would have upon banking reserves. Let us endeavour to ascertain what that effect would be. Under the existing law, the directors of the Bank of England, and the managers of all minor firms, are obliged to look to the maintenance of an adequate reserve, as the one and only means by which their solvency can be secured. No longer enabled to pay their depositors by additional issues of notes, they are compelled, on every occasion upon which an adverse exchange begins to reduce their reserves below the safe proportion, to replenish them by contracting their advances on securities. The contraction of advances contracts the active circulation in the hands of the public, and this contraction proceeds until the value of the currency is brought to a level with foreign currency, and the adverse exchange arrested. The maintenance of

adequate reserves secures the bank and the public from the effects of alarm and distrust, while the timely arrest of the adverse exchange secures the primary object of convertibility.

The existence of a discretionary power of relaxation would produce, even before it came into actual operation, results very different from those above described. The knowledge that a relaxing power was ready to be brought into actual operation on the occurrence of alarm and discredit, would create in the directors and managers of the banks an unfounded and pernicious confidence leading them to overlook and disregard the inevitable consequences of permitting an adverse exchange to effect an undue diminution of their banking reserves. As these reserves were drawn out, they would fail to perceive any immediate necessity for replenishing them by a contraction of their advances on securities. There would be no diminution in the amount of the active circulation in the hands of the public, nor of that confidence by a diminution of which the efficiency of the circulation may be reduced, without an actual decrease in its amount. There would be no rise in the rate of interest, no fall in the prices of commodities and securities; and the drain of gold for exportation would proceed without abatement until, as was the case during the crisis of 1839, the treasure in the coffers of the banks should verge upon exhaustion. At this stage of the process reaction would set in. The danger of another suspension of cash payments would create alarm, discredit, hoarding, a withdrawal of deposits, and a domestic drain, until the intensity of pressure should at length induce a favourable turn in the foreign exchanges, and an influx of gold.

The inability of our statistical economists to draw general conclusions is marvellous. Were an individual trader, possessing a capital of two thousand pounds, to lay it out in the purchase of goods at prices higher than those which the resale of the goods could realise, no advance from his banker could save him from loss. Were he, in expectation of a rise of prices, to seek to recover his loss by additional purchases upon credit at prices beyond those at which his goods could be resold, he would be insolvent; and a further advance from his banker could have no other effect than that of increasing his difficulties. Our statistical economists cannot see that what is true as regards a single tradesman is also true, as regards a thousand—true as regards a hundred thousand—true as regards the whole commercial community. They cannot see that when a considerable proportion of the trading classes has exercised the purchasing power of credit to an extent which exceeds the paying power of consumers, no discretionary increase in the

amount of the circulation can avert insolvency. A discretionary extension of issues by the Bank might afford temporary relief, by aggravating the inevitable result. But we cannot lessen the effect by increasing the cause. We cannot correct the evils of over-trading by supplying the means of prolonging it. When the foundation is too narrow to support the superstructure, we cannot prevent the house from falling by the erection of additional stories. The Hezekiah of Lombard Street, who prays that the day of reckoning may not come in his time, would, had he the strength as well as the blindness of Samson, pull down the pillars of the temple and perish in the ruins—break the Bank before his discounted bills were paid.

When will the legislature—when will the public—open their eyes and their understandings to the lessons of experience? The Act of 1844 has secured us against panics originating in over-issues, exhaustion of treasure, and runs for gold; but it has not, and it could not, secure us against the mitigated panics resulting from over-banking, over-trading, exhaustion of reserves, and runs upon deposits. And what are the means which our statistical economists would adopt for mitigating the evils of these mitigated panics? To remove the cause? To discourage departures from the rules of legitimate banking? To promote the maintenance of a due proportion between reserves and liabilities? Astounding as it may appear, the remedy proposed is the reverse of these. In utter disregard of experience, past and present, the opponents of the Act of 1844 would mitigate the effect of runs upon deposits by superadding to them runs for gold—would return to that system of unrestricted issue which caused in 1825 a double rush for deposits and for gold, and brought us to the verge of a state of barter—which in 1839 sent the directors of the Bank of England to the Bank of France in the character of beggars, and which in the United States has engulfed, as if by a sudden sinking of the solid earth, the pre-existing prosperity of the Union, and created a monetary revulsion which has had no parallel in Europe since the breaking up of the South Sea scheme. A file of the ‘New York Times,’ now before us, teems with accounts of the bankruptcy, ruin, and destitution which have accompanied this terrible industrial collapse. The causes in which it originated, and the results which it has produced, are stated and explained in the following very remarkable and most instructive passages in President Buchanan’s recent message to Congress:—

‘Since the adjournment of the last Congress our constituents have enjoyed an unusual degree of health. The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly, and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the

husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices; and up till within a brief period our manufacturing, mineral, and mechanical occupations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty of all the productions of agriculture, and all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactories suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of skillful labourers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

‘In all former revulsions the blame might have been fairly attributed to operating causes, but not so upon the present occasion. It is apparent that our existing misfortunes have proceeded solely from our extravagant and vicious system of paper currency and bank credit exciting the people to wild speculations and gambling in stocks. These revulsions must continue to recur at successive intervals so long as the amount of the paper currency and bank loans and discounts of the country shall be left to the discretion of 1400 irresponsible banking institutions, which from the very law of their nature will consult the interest of their stock-holders rather than the public welfare.

‘The first duty which these banks owe to the public is to keep in their vaults a sufficient amount of gold and silver to ensure the convertibility of their notes into coin at all times and under all circumstances. No bank ought ever to be chartered without such restrictions on its business as to secure this result. All other restrictions are comparatively vain. This is the only true touchstone—the only efficient regulator of a paper currency—the only one which can guard the public against over issues and bank suspensions.

‘Each of our 1400 banks has but a limited circumference for its circulation, and in the course of a very few days the depositors and note-holders might demand from such a bank a sufficient amount in specie to compel it to suspend, even although it had coin in its vaults equal to one-third of its immediate liabilities; and yet I am not aware, with the exception of the banks of Louisiana, that any State bank throughout the Union has been required by its charter to keep this or any other proportion of gold and silver, compared with the amount of its combined circulation and deposits.

‘What has been the consequence? In a recent report made by the Treasury department on the condition of the banks throughout the different States, according to returns dated nearest to January, 1857, the aggregate amount of actual specie in their vaults is 58,349,838 dols.; of their circulation, 214,778,822 dols.; and of their deposits, 230,351,352 dols. Thus it appears that these banks in the aggregate have considerably less than one dollar in seven of gold and silver compared with their circulation and deposits. It was palpable, therefore, that the very first pressure must drive them to suspension, and deprive the people of a convertible currency, with all its disastrous consequences. It is truly wonderful that they

should have so long continued to preserve their credit, when a demand for the payment of one-seventh of their immediate liabilities would have driven them into insolvency.

‘From this statement it is easy to account for our financial history for the last forty years. It has been a history of extravagant expansions in the business of the country followed by ruinous contractions. At successive intervals the best and most enterprising men have been tempted to their ruin by excessive bank loans of mere paper credit exciting them to extravagant importations of foreign goods, wild speculations, ruinous and demoralising stock gambling. When the crisis arrives, as arrive it must, the banks can extend no relief to the people. In a vain struggle to redeem their liabilities in specie, they are compelled to contract their loans and their issues, and at last, in the hour of distress, when assistance is most needed, they and their debtors together sink into insolvency.’

The concurring panics of England and America present an instructive contrast. They occurred under dissimilar circumstances, and they have issued in different results. In the United States there was a new country, a boundless extent of unappropriated land, a public debt scarcely exceeding the revenue of a single year, a field for employment so ample as to cause a constant influx of labour and capital from Europe, and resources progressively developed during years of uninterrupted peace. In England there was an old and densely-peopled country, land so completely appropriated as to leave no field spot ‘where, without trespass, we could plant a foot,’ a weight of debt which no other country in the world has ever been called upon to bear, a field of employment so over-crowded as to cause an annual exodus of labour and capital from the land, and resources diminished by the vast expenditure of the Russian, Persian, and Chinese wars, still subject to a heavy drain for the suppression of the Indian revolt. Who, upon glancing at these contrasting antecedents, could have hesitated to infer that the occurrence of a commercial revulsion would have proved beyond comparison more disastrous in England than in the United States? Who could have anticipated that when a pressure came, America would fall while England stood apparently unharmed? Yet such has been the actual result. America sank at the first upheaving of the storm. England did not bend to it until a desolating wave from the troubled waters of the west had broken upon her shores. How can this apparent reversal of the natural sequence of events be accounted for? By what latent agency has weakness been conjoined with the elements of strength, and strength with the causes of decline? This unusual conjunction, however anomalous and mysterious it may appear, admits of easy explanation. America has an ill-regulated, Eng-

land a well-regulated currency. In both countries the law requires that the note circulation shall be convertible into gold upon demand; but in the United States the maintenance of a sufficient supply of gold, to secure the fulfilment of the legal requirement, is entrusted to the discretion of the banks; while in England it is secured by the provisions of the Act of 1844. The difference between the practical results of these opposite systems is most instructive. In America the results of entrusting the regulation of the circulation to the discretion of the banks have been the suspension of metallic payments, the insolvency of all the central banks, the extinction of the circulating medium, and a return to a state of barter; while, in England, the results of regulating the circulation in accordance with the action of the foreign exchanges, have secured the maintenance of the metallic payment, and the unquestioned stability of the whole of the metropolitan banks (the Royal British Bank and the Eastern Bank of London were not banking, but swindling establishments), and the retention by the Bank of England of an adequate banking reserve up to the period at which the failure of the Scotch banks, implicated in the American disasters, and not based on the same stable foundations, caused a sudden drain upon its coffers to the extent of 2,000,000*l*.

When the commercial revulsion of 1839 imperilled metallic payments, and sent the Directors of the Bank of England to France for aid, the nation awoke to the necessity of monetary reform. The prophetic warnings of Lord Overstone were no longer disregarded, and Sir Robert Peel was enabled to carry, with the concurrence of the nation, the enactment which has borne us comparatively unhurt through the disastrous crisis under which the commercial credit of the United States suffered an all but total collapse. Will not America—the younger sister of the Saxon race—follow the example of her senior? We do not ask her to borrow from us lessons in monetary science. We ask her, for her own sake no less than for ours, to follow her native lights, and to be guided by the prophetic warnings of her illustrious economist and statesman, Daniel Webster. As regards the principle upon which a paper currency should be regulated, he is a world-wide authority. The following remarkable passage from his speech upon the American panic of 1837, with Lord Overstone's comment upon it, is transcribed from his lordship's evidence before the Commons' Committee of 1840, on Banks of Issue, and from the appendix to his Remarks upon the Management of the Circulation:—

‘ I do not think it is possible to quote, at the present moment, any



authority upon questions of currency more justly deserving of attention than that of the American senator, Mr. Webster.

‘The distinguished reputation of Mr. Webster, as one of the most talented and enlightened members of the American senate, has become better known to the people of this country in consequence of the visit with which he has recently honoured us. His views upon questions of currency, now become more important perhaps in the United States than they are even in this country, must be interesting and instructive to all who give their attention to the subject. The following passage is extracted from the second speech of Mr. Webster on the Sub-Treasury Bill, delivered on the 12th of March, 1838:—

“Before leaving altogether this subject, I will say a few words upon the proper grounds and securities for a paper circulation. I hold it to be of the utmost importance to prove, if it can be proved to the satisfaction of the country, that a convertible paper currency may be so guarded as to be secure against probable dangers. I say, sir, a convertible paper currency, for I lay it down as an unquestionable truth that no paper can be made equal and kept equal to gold and silver, but such as is convertible into gold and silver on demand. But I have gone further, and still go further than this; and I contend that even convertibility, though itself indispensable, is not a certain and unfailing ground of reliance. There is a liability to excessive issues of paper, even while paper is convertible at will. Of this there can be no doubt. Where, then, shall a regulator be found? What principle of prevention may we rely on?

“Now I think, sir, it is too common with banks, in judging of their condition, to set off all their liabilities against all their resources. They look to the quantity of specie in their vaults, and to the notes and bills becoming payable, as means or assets; and with these they expect to be able to meet their returning notes, and to answer the claims of depositors: So far as the bank is to be regarded as a mere bank of discount, all this is very well; but banks of circulation exercise another function. By the very act of issuing their own paper they affect the amount of the currency. In England the Bank of England, and in the United States all the banks, expand or contract the amount of circulation, of course, as they increase or curtail the general amount of their own paper. And this renders it necessary that they should be regulated and controlled. The question is, by what rule? To this I answer, by subjecting all banks to the rule which the most discreet of them always follow—by compelling them to maintain a certain fixed proportion between specie and circulation, without regarding deposits on one hand or notes payable on the other.

“There will always occur occasional fluctuations in trade, and a demand for specie by one country on another will arise. It is too much the practice, when such occurrences take place and specie is leaving the country, for banks to issue more paper, in order to prevent a scarcity of money. But exactly the opposite course should be adopted. A demand for specie to go abroad should be regarded as conclusive evidence of the necessity of contracting circulation.

If, indeed, in such cases it could be certainly known that the demand would be of short duration, the temporary pressure might be relieved by an issue of paper to fill the place of departing specie. But this never can be known. There is no safety, therefore, but in meeting the case at the moment, and in conforming to the infallible index of the exchanges. Circulating paper is thus kept always nearer to the character and to the circumstances of that of which it is designed to be the representative—the metallic money. This subject might be pursued, I think, and clearly illustrated; but, for the present, I only express my belief that, with experience before us and with the lights which recent discussions, both in Europe and America, hold out, a national bank might be established, with more regard to its function of regulating currency than to its function of discount, on principles, and subject to regulations such as should render its operations extremely useful.”

On these remarkable passages in the speech of the American economist and statesman, Lord Overstone comments as follows:—

‘The intrinsic soundness of these views, as well as the forcible clearness with which they are stated, must command attention. The individual from whose lips they fell has returned to his native country to witness, upon his first arrival, the consequences which have ensued from the rejection of his wise counsel—the suspension of specie payments—the violent derangement of internal exchanges—the utter prostration of credit—and a ruinous interruption to the trading and commercial operations of the Union. In again urging upon his fellow-countrymen those measures by the timely adoption of which they might probably have averted the present crisis, and may still protect themselves against its future recurrence, he will be strengthened by the impressive example of what has recently occurred.

• ‘As being our brethren in blood and in language, and still more as having staked even more deeply than ourselves all their hopes of internal happiness and national prosperity upon the efficacy of free institutions, the American people must always command our warmest sympathies; as rivals in commercial activity and as connected with this country by mutual ties of the strongest interest, their prosperity must ever exert a powerful influence upon our welfare. The shock to which they have been exposed has been felt in its vibrations throughout the United Kingdom; and a regard for the prosperity of our own country, in concert with more generous sympathies, must create an anxious desire to see the monetary affairs of the United States established upon a sound and durable basis. To the measures necessary for this purpose, many national prejudices, and possibly some party hostility may be opposed; “nations are slow and reluctant learners;” but the views of Mr. Webster, as above quoted, by the force of their own truth, and the vigorous exposition which he is capable of applying to them, must gradually impress themselves upon the conviction of a reflecting community. May this result be speedily brought about. The intercommercial interests of both countries are involved in it. To the wise and enlightened of his own

country he must look for effectual co-operation ; whilst, from this side of the Atlantic, we can only offer to him our cordial sympathy and good wishes for success in his endeavours to obtain the establishment of "a national bank, instituted with more regard to its function of regulating currency than to its function of discount,"—"a bank able to restrain the excessive issues of state banks, and able also to furnish for the country a currency of universal credit and of uniform value."

Should the Government of the United States adopt the principles of Mr. Webster, as the Government of England has adopted those of Lord Overstone, panics such as those from which the two countries are now emerging, might be regarded as impossible, except under contingencies—famine, rebellion, invasion—against which no prospective legislation can provide. Mitigated panics, originating in over-banking and over-trading, and involving exhaustion of reserves and loss of deposits, would still occasionally occur ; but they would not be accompanied and intensified by exhaustion of bullion, suspension of cash payments, and extinction of the established medium of exchange. Two countries linked together by an international trade, more extensive than ever before existed in the world, would not be periodically deprived of the means of adjusting their international balances. But the final battle which must ultimately realise this consummation has yet to be fought, not only in America but in England. The country of Adam Smith repudiates the doctrines of the 'Wealth of Nations.' The member for the commercial metropolis of Scotland parades in the House of Commons his slender knowledge of the most elementary principles of commercial and monetary science ; and the crowds who verify the doctrine of Mr. Gladstone, that 'currency is a cause of insanity,' rave against the renewal of the Act of 1844. But truth will triumph—science cannot recede. The monetary centre—the enlightened merchants and bankers of the metropolis—demand that there shall be no relaxation of the law which maintains the integrity of the monetary standard. Bristol has rebuked Glasgow. The leading journal, not of England, but of the world, has rendered inestimable service. 'The Manchester Guardian,' the organ of the great manufacturing centre, powerfully aids the dissemination of sound economical principles. The 'Scotsman,' faithful to its antecedents, redeems its country from the discredit of the recent meeting in support of illegitimate banking, by ably and successfully advocating the doctrines of Adam Smith, Ricardo, and Overstone. We look forward with confidence to the Report of the Parliamentary Committee, and to the decision of the Cabinet. On moving for the re-appointment

of the Select Committee of Inquiry, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a speech which commanded the assent of a triumphant majority of the Commons, not only announced the intention of the Government to adhere to the Act of 1844, but affirmed his concurrence in the cardinal principles,—that an increase of issues upon securities would diminish, in a corresponding degree, the issues against bullion, and weaken the position of the Bank, without increasing the circulation—and that unforeseen emergencies should be encountered, not by a relaxing power engrafted on the Act, but by the executive authority, upon its own responsibility, and subject to the future award of Parliament, as was originally suggested by Mr. Huskisson. The ever-successful statesman, who was long a colleague in office with the first and most scientific reformer of our commercial code—who, in conjunction with Huskisson, relinquished office rather than resist Reform—who caught, as foreign minister, the mantle of Canning—who, as war minister, turned, like Chatham, disaster to victory—will now, as heretofore, be master of the situation; and, as we venture confidently to anticipate, will do what Huskisson would have done,—will consummate the work which Huskisson and Peel commenced, but left unfinished; and will permanently secure to England the inestimable advantages of a currency regulated in accordance with the true principles of monetary science.

## NOTE

*To the Article on Lord Campbell's Lives of the Chief Justices of England, No. 216., p. 433.*

WE have received from Sir Peter Laurie a copy of the following correspondence between himself and the noble author of the 'Lives of the Chief Justices,' in which it will be seen that Sir Peter disclaims the speech erroneously attributed to him by Lord Campbell and quoted by ourselves. This correspondence has not, we believe, been previously published, and was unknown to us when we commented on Lord Campbell's version of the story. Both versions of it turn out to be unfounded, and we regret that we should unintentionally have caused annoyance to Sir Peter Laurie by repeating it. The letters referred to are as follows:—

*Sir Peter Laurie to Lord Campbell.*

' 7. Park Square, N. W., June 20, 1857.

' My dear Lord,

' At page 337. of the last volume of your "Chief Justices" my name is introduced in a very uncomplimentary manner.

' Now, as Lord Tenterden died before my mayoralty, it is manifest

that the story is entirely unfounded in fact, and that I and the joke, such as it is, are both treated unhandsomely.

‘I am sure that the equity of the judge will so far outweigh the necessity of the author as to insure the omission of this blunder in those future editions to which this, like the other works of your lordship, is doubtless destined.

‘The profound respect I entertained for the late Lord Chief Justice, and the kindness I always experienced from him, require me to write to the present Lord Tenterden, and prove to him that it was as impossible in fact as, I trust, all who know me will admit it to be improbable, that I could have been guilty of such offensive vulgarity.

‘Believe me, my dear Lord,’

‘Very faithfully yours,

‘P. LAURIE.

‘The Right Honourable

‘Lord CAMPBELL, &c. &c. &c.’

*Lord Campbell to Sir Peter Laurie.*

‘Stratheden House, June 22. 1857.

‘My dear Sir Peter,

‘I am sadly grieved to find that I have given pain to a gentleman whom I so much respect. I assure you I have often heard the anecdote as I have related it, on seemingly excellent authority, and I thought that I could not properly omit it; but you have proved that I have been misinformed, and I beg you to accept my apology.

‘I remain yours very faithfully, 2

‘CAMPBELL.

‘Sir Peter LAURIE.’

052 EDI

Vol. 107 (P. 147)



THE

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1858.

No. CCXVIII.



- ART. I. — 1. *The Annals of San Francisco.* By FRANK SOULÉ, JOHN H. GIBON, M.D., and JAMES NISBET. 8vo. New York: 1854.
2. *California Indoors and Out; or, How we Farm, Mine, and Live generally in the Golden State.* By ELIZA W. FARNHAM. 8vo. New York: 1856.
3. *California and its Resources.* By ERNEST SEYD. 8vo. London: 1858.

JUST ten years ago we laid before the readers of this Review an outline of the progress of settlement in North America, together with some general conjectures as to its future prospects, in an article on the commercial statistics of the late Mr. Macgregor. It is not without interest to ourselves, in which we hope we may find some to share, that we have recently looked back at this memorial of the thoughts and calculations of a period which already seems separated from us by a large tract of history. The Irish famine was just over. The mighty 'exodus' which followed it had just commenced; and though no diviner of that day could prognosticate its dimensions or its results, yet the signs of that great event were already forcing themselves on the observation of the world. That the westward march of the nations was receiving a new and extraordinary impulse, we could perceive: more than this, much greater sagacity than ours was unable as yet to conjecture. It creates something of a solemn feeling, when we endeavour to annihilate in imagination, for a moment, those ten years—to replace ourselves at the point we occupied in 1847, peering, as well as we might, into the 'dark forward and abysm of time.' Given the

continuance of certain conditions, experience may forecast the future; but who can foresee the continuance of those conditions? Men studied the social and economical results of the cultivation of the potato and the vine, as if these were to proceed in their old course of development to the end of time; the mysterious blights of these vegetables came on us, like the canker and the palmer worm of old, 'my great army, which I will send among you:' and the populations depending on these far-spreading branches of industry have been starved, or uprooted from their homes, or changed in their habits, and our estimates and prognostics have passed away as dreams. We built our political economy on the presumed annual returns of gold and silver, as if the elements of calculation were all but established quantities: all at once, and simultaneously, in two distant quarters of the globe, discoveries were made which have changed the entire aspect of monetary affairs, and reduced the volumes of metallic lore, produced before 1847, into as mere obsolescence as speculations on the metal plates of the Jewish Temple, or the golden bricks of King Cræsus of Lydia. And thus the world advances: its ordinary cycles of progress and retreat interrupted ever and anon by strange, comet-like phenomena, which seem to have their origin far away in another order of things, and yet are, doubtless, not less reducible to general principles than the recurring events of ordinary life, and not less regularly interposed, as secondary causes, between us and that remote but infinite Will which governs all.

A few words will suffice to place succinctly before the reader the general results of the last ten years -- the most important decennium, by far, in the history of colonisation. Within that period the population of Canada has increased a third: that of the Australian colonies from three or four hundred thousand to nearly a million. The province of Victoria alone, scarcely existing in 1847, has now three millions of annual revenue: a future Great Britain has been founded and organised in New Zealand: three new States, and seven or eight Territories, have been added to the North American Union, by occupation or by conquest from Mexico; California, with which we are now about to concern ourselves, being by far the most important of these gains. The commercial world has acquired three great emporia: two on the shores of the Pacific, of which the names are already as familiar in our ears as those of Hamburg or Amsterdam: one on the great American lakes, which, though less spoken of among ourselves, is perhaps the most remarkable creation of the three: San Francisco, Melbourne, Chicago. In the 1849 edition of Mr. McCulloch's carefully compiled

Dictionary of Geography, not one of the three is even named. And, lastly, to conclude our recapitulation of the exploits of this decennium with some notice of the preparation it has made for the future extension of similar exploits—the capital it has created for future use,—we must point out that it has constructed a railway across the Isthmus of Panama, all but completed one across the Isthmus of Suez, established steam communication across all the oceanic highways of the globe, except the Pacific, and covered the European continent and its seas with the network of the electric telegraph.

These are indeed stupendous achievements to be accomplished in one seventh of the ordinary life of man. And it is hardly probable that they will be repeated on an equal scale; not unless similar phenomena, beyond the control of ordinary human actions and agencies, should recur,—the simultaneous destruction of the food of a nation, with the discovery of extensive natural magazines of gold on two different points of the earth's surface. Immigration, from these islands at least, has already considerably fallen off, and seems likely, for the present, to continue to decline. Enough, however, of the colonising impulse still remains to render the future bright with promise; and there is probably no portion of the earth's surface, as yet all but unoccupied, which offers so vast a field for the future extension of Christendom (we use the old-fashioned word as including the religion, race, and civilisation of a Christian people), as North-western America, from the Mexican frontier to or beyond the Russian boundary.

We said on the former occasion to which we now refer, that there appeared then little probability that this region, so inviting to white immigration, could receive any great amount of it by overland travel from the Atlantic States. The distance appeared too enormous—the hardships to be undergone too severe—for more than the transit of occasional recruits from the boldest class of pioneers. And notwithstanding the new element introduced into the calculation by the all-disturbing discovery of gold, and the epidemic rage for its acquisition which signalled the mad years 1849—1851, the event has certainly supported this view. As far as we can collect the facts, not above one-sixth of the white inhabitants of California have penetrated thither by the overland route; but the bones of many thousands who have perished in the attempt, are bleaching on the desolate prairies, or in the 'Canyons' of the Rocky Mountains. The strange establishment of the Mormon Republic, half-way between the frontier of Kansas and that of California, might have tended greatly to facilitate the communication; but, under the circum-



stances, has probably rather impeded it. The mass of immigration has reached San Francisco by sea in the first years of the gold discovery; chiefly by the magnificent fleet of 'clippers' which American enterprise soon made to circulate round Cape Horn.

'The clipper ship,' say the Annalists of California, 'is virtually the creation of San Francisco. The necessity of bearing merchandise as speedily as possible to so distant a market,—one too which was so liable to be overstocked by goods,—early forced merchants and ship-builders interested in the Californian trade to invent new and superior models of vessels. Hence the modern clipper with her great length, sharp lines of entrance and clearance, and flat bottom. These magnificent vessels now perform the longest regular voyage known in commerce, running along both coasts of the Americas in about four months.'

But since the construction of the railway across the Isthmus of Panama, the passenger traffic to California principally takes that course. In truth, the impracticable region which occupies the centre of North America is scarcely less than a thousand miles in average width—a barrier of several mountain ranges, alternating with sandy or rocky plains, almost without perennial rivers, and subject to a climate of extreme winter rigour. The American State of California—a country about as large as France—has an extremely simple topography. It occupies, in the first place, a long valley, bounded east by the Sierra Nevada, west by a maritime range of little elevation, and communicating with the ice through the single outlet of the harbour of San Francisco, picturesquely termed 'the Golden Gate' by its modern inhabitants; and secondly, the slope of the maritime Sierra to the sea.

The region comprised within these limits appears undoubtedly, all exaggeration apart, to be one of the most desirable and lovely portions of the earth. It affords every variety of surface, from the snowy range to the wide-spread pastoral valley, only in extensive plain country it is rather deficient. Its climate, for purposes of human life and enjoyment, is nearly the finest known. It has a temperature answering to that of Italy; but with drier and serener skies, and an infinitely purer air. It occupies exactly the happy interval between the aridity of Mexico and the dripping climate of North-western America.

'The year,' says Mr. Seyd, 'is divided into the dry and rainy seasons. The dry season includes the greatest part of the spring, all the summer, and a great part of the fall. During this time there is *constant sunshine*. Heavy dews fall in spring and autumn, whilst the summer nights, at least in high summer, are more or less dry. Near the coast the heat is moderate, owing to the breezes which blow during the hottest part of the day, and the temperature is rarely so

high as that of an English summer. In some of the counties — far in the interior however — the heat is much greater in proportion to their latitude, on account of the absence of these cooling sea-breezes.

‘In the middle of the day the heat in the interior is sometimes great, but it has nothing of that depressing, suffocating character which we observe during a hot summer day in England. The atmosphere retains its clearness and invigorating influence. But however warm a day may have been, towards evening the air becomes fresher and cooler; and whilst the temperature remains very mild and agreeable, it is just cool enough to make you enjoy a light blanket; and this pleasant freshness contrasts strongly with the sweltering and suffocating nights in some parts of Europe or the tropics. The rainy season generally commences in the latter part of November, and lasts till about April. But it must not be supposed that by *rainy season* we mean *perpetual rain*; it may rain sometimes for a week or fortnight together with occasional cessations during the day, but then again there are intervals of fine sunny weather, lasting also a week or a fortnight, and these are perhaps without exception the most agreeable periods of the year, so mild, so freshly green, so comfortably warm, and such a relief after a long spell of rain. In fact, the rainy season in California resembles nothing so much as a rather rainy summer in England. The temperature very rarely falls below zero, and ice has made its appearance but a few times; snow is very seldom seen except in the mountainous regions towards the Rocky Mountains, where it falls copiously, and supplies the streams with water during the summer.

‘A curious feature in the climate of California is the almost total absence of thunderstorms. In the south of the state they are said to occur sometimes, but farther north they are unknown, and the rolling of the artillery of heaven has never been felt in San Francisco. Slight shocks of earthquake are felt occasionally, as all along the Pacific shores, originating, no doubt, from the volcanoes of the Sandwich Islands, some thousand miles from us; but these vibrations are very slight, and never create alarm or do the least damage.

‘From the above description the reader will perceive that the climate is a very moderate one, requiring scarcely ever very light or very heavy clothing, and one might almost wear one suit of moderately thick texture, say black cloth, from year’s end to year’s end.’

‘The air of California is fresh and invigorating, having a most beneficial effect upon the blood and lungs. But its crystal clearness is most extraordinary. Looking from an elevation upon a widely extended landscape, you are surprised at the distinctness of every object: the outlines of the thirty to fifty miles distant mountains are as sharply defined as by the finest cutting instrument, so that they appear much nearer than they really are, and every shade of colour is distinctly visible. Standing on Telegraph Hill in San Francisco, you have a most splendid view of the city itself, and of the large bay, with Oaklands some nine miles distant on the opposite shore, and although the large vessels in the harbour appear but small boats, you

can yet plainly distinguish every rope and line in them, and almost fancy you can grasp the trees of distant Oaklands, so beautifully clear and transparent—almost painfully clear to the unaccustomed eye—is the atmosphere of California.

‘The brilliancy of a moonlight night is so great that common print can be easily read, and objects at a great distance be discerned with little difficulty. We have ourselves, from the top of a hill, seen distinctly the houses of a town some eight miles distant.’

We should be sorry to endorse all the raptures of Mr. Seyd, who writes in the avowed character of an emigration agent for California: but we believe, from comparing other accounts, that he has but little overrated the substantial merits of the climate. The drought of the summer, however, is trying to Europeans; and San Francisco itself, situated in a funnel which collects the sea blasts and discharges them inland, seems by no means an attractive locality in this respect. ‘If the winter be not unusually wet’—say Mrs. Farnham, who, however, has an especial grudge against the place, --

‘there is some delightful weather to be enjoyed. If it be, you are flooded, and the rainy season closes, to give place to what is miscalled summer: a season so cold, that you require more clothing than you did in January; so damp with fog and mists, that you are penetrated to the very marrow; so windy, that if you are abroad in the afternoon it is a continual struggle. Your eyes are blinded, your teeth set on edge, and your whole person made so uncomfortable by the sand that has insinuated itself through your clothing, that you could not conceive it possible to feel a sensation, short of a warm bath and shower by way of preliminaries. These, as water is very scarce (and, for the most part, very bad), it is as yet impossible to have in dwelling-houses; consequently, you give yourself up to a state of physical wretchedness, your self-respect declines, and you go on from day to day, hoping more and more faintly, on each succeeding one, that your moral nature may withstand these trials of the material, but feeling, if you are possessed of ordinary sensibilities, lively apprehensions that your friends will have cause to deplore the issue.’ (P. 78.)

One invaluable characteristic of the climate deserves notice: ‘the absence of decomposing qualities is most remarkable.’ Malaria, ague, low-fever, seem almost unknown, and a Chadwick would find himself as much out of place in California as a Meehi in the great Sahara. Well was it for San Francisco, during its gold fever, that other epidemics seemed to avoid it. The wretched emigrants, who died by thousands of sheer exhaustion, rather than diseases, lay unburied or half-buried almost in the very streets.

‘Coffins and shrouds were luxuries which the dead needed not,’ say the *Annals*, ‘and the living could not share. . . . People could

not be troubled to walk slowly and reverently half a mile, in those busy times, to inter a dead stranger. A shallow hole in the nearest open space served the purpose just as well as the grandest mausoleum would have done. In grading the streets, sinking wells, and digging the foundations of houses in after years, the bones of such as had been buried in this fashion were frequently brought to light.'

No Nemesis, however, visited with pestilence this savage disregard of the last decent solemnities: the corpses were mummified by the process of nature as they lay.

The better portions of California appear to be singularly adapted for almost all the agriculture of temperate regions, by soil as well as climate. If indeed we may put faith in our local authorities, every production of the earth, native and cultivated, from the cabbage to the pine tree, puts to shame the corresponding specimens of the worn-out East. But we cannot tell how much may be owing to that Cyclopean grandeur of description in which American fancy is apt to indulge. At the 'State Agricultural Fair,' held at Sacramento, 1855, were exhibited, among other prodigies, a beet weighing 73 lbs.: a carrot weighing 10 lb. and 3 feet 3 inches in length: 'there were fifty in the same bed of equal size:' a corn stalk measuring 21 feet 9 inches in height: an apple measuring 15½ inches each way! Whatever may be the real truth in the matter of beetroot and tomatas, there can be no reasonable doubt of the enormous dimensions which the forest trees reach in some localities. Generally speaking, California, except towards the north, appears to be by no means a thickly wooded country, especially when compared with the Atlantic seaboard of the United States. The sparse character of Mexican vegetation continues for many degrees northward. But some portions of the skirts of both the Sierras are clothed with forests of incomparable grandeur: where different varieties of enormous pines, and that problematical monster, the 'Wellingtonia' of English nursery-gardeners, grow and decay, generation after generation, in solitudes as yet unbroken by Yankee lumberers. 'On the rancho of Captain 'Graham,' about five miles from the Mission near which Mrs. Farnham established herself, near the coast, some sixty miles south of San Francisco, —

'is a tract of forest, in which the trees are of enormous size. On all sides of you rise immense boles, whose altitude is reckoned by hundreds of feet, and whose diameter is from ten to twelve, fourteen, and eighteen feet, at the height of a man. One known as the Big Tree, measures 300 feet, at nearly nineteen-across at six feet from the ground. Yet people in passing for it not unfrequently pass it, so unnoticeable is it among its neighbouring neighbours. These trees are of

a species of cedar: the red wood of the country, of which the lumber is chiefly manufactured.'

The famous forest of 'Wellingtonia gigantea' from whence the specimen of bark was derived which may still be seen, we think, at the Crystal Palace, is to be found, if we may believe Mr. Seyd, in the county of Calaveras, on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada, and nearly in the latitude of San Francisco. 'The 'Father of the forest' a prostrate tree, of which the same authority gives us a lithograph sketch, 'measures fifty feet in diameter at the base, *supposed* height when standing above 500 feet!' that is, a good deal higher than S. Paul's! But California is not contented with supremacy in the vegetable world alone. Her waterfalls and precipices, we are informed, are on a scale equally superior to all similar wonders in the old world and the new. In the Yohamite valley, Mariposa county, a river as large as the Thames at Richmond takes a single leap of 2,100 feet perpendicular, the total height of the fall being 3,100!

Such was the beautiful region over which a few Spanish missionaries maintained for two centuries their somnolent, peaceful theocracy, before the advent of the American squatters.

'Where was ever a people so steeped in contentment as that which was found here? The labours of the devoted Jesuit missionaries had planted the cross beneath those lovely skies, long years before they came hither. The Indians were already converted, to their hands, from lawless enemies to useful and perfectly manageable servants. How they luxuriated in the ease of their abundance! How they reposed on the generous soil whose redundant energies sprang to their coarse husbandry, with a profusion scarcely equalled in any other clime habitable by the white race! With what a pleasing but unlabourious joy we may imagine them hailing the safe arrivals of the trading vessels that visited their coast! Their herds multiplied without care, and their *frijoles* and grains, once sown, required no diurnal (annual) renewing. Crops sufficient for their plentiful subsistence,—and what wanted they more? came spontaneously; the first, second, and sometimes the third year, after the seed had been sown. Their horses were fleet, and so numerous, that it was no extravagance to destroy them whenever caprice, pleasure, or convenience (and they rarely knew more earnest motives) dictated. Their greatest luxury was ease; ambition was unknown to them as a people. They were born, they matured, and died, in an undisturbed round of animal enjoyment.' (*Mrs. Farnham*, p. 323.)

It must, however, be added, that the chronic state of revolution in Mexico, and the fears of impending secularisation, had rendered the fathers very careless in the management of their property, and brought their affairs into a state of dilapidation, long before the American irruption. Their highest period of

prosperity seems to have been about 1824; from that time their wealth and civilisation appear to have declined; and there can be no doubt that the few industrious and energetic dwellers in this land of indolence heartily welcomed the arrival of the Anglo-Saxon settlers who were so soon to 'improve them off the face of the earth.'

The annals of Filibusterism, however, are among the meanest portions of history, nor can they be elevated into dignity by the colouring of tawdry romance, in which our American brethren are in the habit of dressing them up. We omit, therefore, all the details of the gradual annexation of California, with which the 'Annals' furnish us; the 'premature' attempt of the gallant Commodore Jones in 1842, who hoisted the stars and stripes at Monterey in a time of profound peace, and had to haul them down and 'restore the place to its former owners, with as handsome an apology as he could make for his extraordinary proceedings;' the valorous deeds of Colonel John C. Fremont, since illustrious on a greater stage; or the 'bold, daring, and energetic measures adopted in 1845, and prosecuted by Commodore Robert F. Stockton,' who is evidently the favourite hero of the Annalists. The private hostilities of these gentlemen against the Creole population became national acts, and they were themselves converted, not perhaps altogether to their own satisfaction, from buccaneers into legitimate warriors, by the declaration of war between the United States and Mexico in 1846. Stockton, with three hundred sailors and marines on foot, daringly marched into the interior to attack the Mexican General, Castro, who had more than twice his number of mounted soldiers, and seven pieces of artillery, at the mission of Los Angeles. The general

'informed the commodore by a courier, "that if he marched upon the town he would find it the grave of his men." "Then," said the commodore, "tell the general to have the bells ready to toll in the morning at eight o'clock, as I shall be there at that time." He was there: but Castro in the meantime had broken up his camp, mounted with an armed band, and fled.'

The authority of the Mexican Federation dissolved into thin air. California was annexed to the States as a territory; and after fighting through one desperate insurrection of the unhappy Creoles, who, as usual, plucked up a spirit when it was too late, the Americans consolidated their dominion by the peace of 1848, and the illegitimate title of the filibuster merged in the recognised right of the conqueror.

At the close of hostilities, California was supposed to contain from 12,000 to 15,000 white inhabitants; Creoles, Yankees,

'runaway seamen, and adventurers of all nations,' and not a few Mormons, the scattered forerunners of the great westward migration of that community.

At this period there stood on the site of the future city of San Francisco, near the mission of that name, a little Spanish village entitled 'Yerba Buena,' which had grown up close to the 'Golden Gate,' and at the best point of the bay for the establishment of a harbour. In 1836, one Jacob Primer Leese established himself as a trader on this spot. Much altercation and bitterness of spirit ensued between him and the Californian authorities of the time, before he could obtain a lot 'in the spot where the St. Francis Hotel was subsequently erected, at the corner of Clay and Dupont Streets.' Here he erected his house — the parent of the future city — and covered it in, with a prophetic foresight, on the 4th of July. Shortly afterwards he married a sister of General Vallejo, one of the few natives who had the sense and energy to go shares with the speculating Americans who were appropriating the land; and 'from this union, on the 15th of April, 1838, sprung their oldest child, 'Rosalie Leese, being the first born in Yerba Buena.' This Eve of San Francisco must, therefore, if she still lives, have attained the patriarchal age of twenty. Her family, it seems, have since removed to Oregon. In 1847 the population of Yerba Buena amounted to about 450 souls. In January that year, under the auspices of 'Washington A. Bartlett, chief magistrate,' (the town being then held by the Americans at war with Mexico), its name was changed by ordinance to San Francisco.

By a singular coincidence, the discovery of gold, which was to transform this petty village in five years into one of the great marts of the world, took place in January 1848, just as the Americans were obtaining undisputed possession, on the land of Captain Sutter, about sixty miles east of the now Sacramento city, on the south fork of the 'Rio de los Americanos.' One James W. Marshall, who had contracted with Sutter to build a saw mill, first discovered the glittering particles in the mud of the brook on which he was at work.

'All trembling with excitement, he hurried to his employer, and told his story. Captain Sutter at first thought it was a fiction, and the teller only a mad fool. Indeed, he confesses that he kept a sharp eye upon his loaded rifle, when he, whom he was tempted to consider a maniac, was disclosing his marvellous tale. However, his doubts were all at an end when Marshall tossed on the table before him an ounce or two of the shining dust. The two agreed to keep the matter secret, and quietly share the golden harvest between them. But, as

they afterwards searched more narrowly together, and gloated upon the rich deposits, their eager gestures and looks, and muttered, broken words, happened to be closely watched by a Mormon labourer employed about the neighbourhood. He followed their movements, and speedily became as wise as themselves.' (*Annals*, p. 132.)

Marshall, it appears, did not escape the ordinary lot of discoverers, including many a greater benefactor of his species than himself. The author of the revelation which has added so many millions to the metallic wealth of the world, 'wanders poor and 'homeless over the land,' say the Annalists. General Sutter, a Swiss by birth, a man of many projects, and the original ground landlord of Sacramento city, 'at present resides at Hock Farm, leading the happy, contented life of a tiller of the soil.' And so, in Mr. Carlyle's phrase, the pair 'vanish from the tissue 'of our history,' and are lost in the dense mass of human figures, swarming into the path which they have opened.

For now — in 1848 — began that wonderful flood of immigration into the newly proclaimed Eldorado, which, though followed, and in some degree surpassed, by similar events in Australia, remains on record as one of the most remarkable passages in the recent history of man. The phenomena of that wild epidemic are almost beyond the power of description. Whoever attempts it seems to stray, almost inevitably, into that superlative vein which our Transatlantic brethren are so apt to use in portraying the vulgarest occurrences, that when they have to deal with a really heroic subject, they have no resource but to pile up their magniloquence until it fairly falls over into the burlesque.

'The circles of excitement grew wider and wider, and scarcely lost strength as they spread farther distant. First the Mexicans from the nearest, and then those from the remotest provinces, flocked to California. The indolent, yet adventurous, half-wild population of Sonora passed in its many thousands from the south; while Oregon from the north sent its sturdy settlers in almost equal numbers. The Sandwich Islands followed, with their strange motley of white and coloured races. Peru and Chili then hurried, an innumerable crowd, as fast as ships could be obtained to carry them to the land of gold. Before long, China sent forward her thousands of thrifty, wandering children, feeble, indeed, both in body and mind, but persevering; and, from their union into labouring companies, capable of great feats. Australia likewise contributed her proportion of clever rascals, and, perhaps, as many clever adventurers who had not been convicted felons. The United States, which at all times contain a vast roving and excitable population, next were affected to their very centres; and armies, to use a moderate term, were organised instantly to proceed to California and share in the golden spoil. The year



1848 was lost for the land passage, but by the early summer of 1849, great and numerous caravans were in full march, by various routes, across the Rocky Mountains. Many hardships were endured by these immigrants, and numbers died on the road. But their unburied bodies and bleaching skeletons were unheeded by the succeeding throng, or only pointed out to the weary yet restless travellers the path where others had gone before, and which, perhaps, the new comers should only avoid. On — on — to the land of gold! Round Cape Horn, fleets were bearing additional thousands; while through Mexico to all her eastern ports, and especially across the Isthmus of Panama, still other thousands were hurrying by new ships on the Pacific, to the "Golden Gate." Later in the year, and somewhat diminished in intensity, the excitement produced in Europe similar results. Many of the young, strong, and adventurous, the idle, dissipated, reckless, sanguine youths of great Britain, France, and Germany, broke through the ties of home, friends, and country, and perhaps of civilisation itself, and embarked for California, to seize fortune in a bound, and with one eager clutch, or to perish in the attempt. These astonishing circumstances soon gathered a population of a quarter of a million of the wildest, bravest, most intelligent, yet most reckless, and perhaps dangerous beings ever before collected into one small district of country.' (*Animals*, pp. 133, 134.)

Our present concern is with the civil history of California, and not with the statistics of her gold-fields: we will therefore only recapitulate very briefly the results of the tables published by Mr. Newmarch in the concluding volume of 'Tooke's History of Prices.' The produce of gold in California rose in 1851 to nine millions sterling, in 1852 to thirteen millions: since which time the increase has been slow, the total in 1856 having been 15,400,000*l*. Altogether, California has added to the metallic circulation of the world about one hundred millions. How far the improvements which are going on in the process of 'quartz crushing' may tend to counteract the evident decrease in the available surface deposits — never so rich as those of Australia — remains as yet unproved; but we believe that some half-dozen English companies have perished, or are in process of decent interment, under the Winding-up Act, from the prosecution of this line of enterprise, in which American speculators on the spot are said still to make very adequate profits.

We must not omit to mention, that the more recent discovery of great wealth in that rarest and most retiring of the precious products of the earth, quicksilver, bids fair to secure to California a more permanent source of prosperity than her gold-fields themselves. These mines have already cheapened quicksilver, and thereby stimulated the silver-producing industry of Mexico and South America, to such an

extent, as to render improbable the prognostications of the relative change in value of gold and silver so generally indulged in of late years.

The available auriferous districts have been hitherto exclusively confined to the basin of the Sacramento River, of which San Francisco commands the natural outlet. All the maritime trade of those regions is therefore concentrated in that single spot. At the close of 1849 it numbered 20,000 inhabitants. In 1853, nearly 50,000, including 5000 Germans, 5000 French, 3000 Spanish Americans (popularly termed 'Greasers'), and 3000 Chinese. Since that time the increase has been slow.

How unparalleled an aspect did this marvellous place present during those four years, into which the ordinary events of a century were crowded! A great city was raised from its foundations, and whole quarters of it four times rebuilt, after destruction by the 'great fires;' its institutions organised, its municipal requirements provided for, a mass of labour, both physical and mental, bestowed on its erection equal to what may be expended in many centuries in perpetuating the somnolent existence of some Italian or German city of old renown; and all this amidst the excitement of the neighbouring gold-fields, continually exhausting and continually renewing the settled population, and with a range of prices for the commonest articles of life and industry, which alone would seem enough to have rendered the employment of such continuous labour impossible.

Every week dispatched its thousands to the diggings, and saw its hundreds of successful adventurers return to dissipate their earnings, in the wild enjoyment of that luxury which had established itself, the clinging parasite of wealth, in the streets of the infant metropolis. The harbour was crowded with masts, but the 'ships, sailorless, lay rotting on the sea;' their crews were at the diggings, and the return of a vessel mattered little to any one but the owners, for California had nothing to send in exchange for freights of bulky merchandise, except a few ounces of precious dust. The perplexity of employers of domestic services or labour was ludicrous; but the pertinacity with which they struggled through their difficulties, was heroic.

'When subsequently immigrants began to arrive in numerous bands, any amount of labour could be obtained, provided always a most unusually high price was paid for it. Returned diggers, and those who cautiously had never went [*Anglicè, gone*] to the mines, were then also glad enough to work for rates varying from twelve to thirty dollars a-day, at which terms most capitalists were somewhat afraid to commence any heavy undertaking. The hesitation was only for an

instant; soon all the labour that could possibly be procured was in ample request at whatever rates were demanded. The population of a great State was suddenly flocking in on them, and no preparations had hitherto been made for its reception. Building lots had to be surveyed, and streets graded and planked, hills levelled, hollows, lagoons, and the bay itself piled, capped, filled up, and planked; lumber, bricks, and all other building materials provided at most extraordinary high prices. Houses built, finished, and furnished; great warehouses and stores erected; wharves run far out into the sea; numberless tons of goods removed from shipboard, and delivered and shipped anew everywhere; and ten thousand other things had all to be done without a moment's unnecessary delay. Long before these things were completed, the sand hills and barren ground around the town were overspread with a multitude of canvass, blanket, and bough-covered tents. The bay was alive with shipping and small craft carrying passengers and goods backwards and forwards; the unplanked, ungraded, unformed streets—at one time moving heaps of dry sand and dust, at another miry abysses, whose treacherous depths sucked in horse and dray (and occasionally man himself), were crowded with human beings from every corner of the universe, and of every tongue; all excited and busy, plotting, speaking, working, buying and selling town lots, shiploads of every kind of assorted merchandise, the ships themselves if they could, though that was not often, gold-dust in hundredweights, ranchos square leagues in extent, with their thousands of cattle, allotments in hundreds of contemplated towns, already prettily designed and laid out,—on paper,—and, in short, speculating and gambling in every branch of modern commerce, and in many strange things peculiar to the time and the place. *And everybody made money, and was suddenly growing rich.*

‘The loud voices of the eager seller and as eager buyer, the laugh of reckless joy, the bold accents of successful speculation, the stir and hum of active hurried labour, as man and brute, horse and bullock, and their guides, struggled and managed through heaps of loose rubbish, over hills of sand, and among deceiving deep mud pools and swamps, filled the amazed newly-arrived immigrant with an almost appalling sense of the exuberant life, energy, and enterprise of the place. He breathed quick and faintly, his limbs grew weak as water, and his heart sunk within him as he thought of the dreadful conflict, when he approached and mingled among that confused and terrible business battle.

‘Gambling saloons, glittering like fairy palaces, like them suddenly sprung into existence, studding nearly all sides of the Plaza, and every street in its neighbourhood. As if intoxicating drinks from the well plenished and splendid bar they each contained were insufficient to gild the scene, music added its loudest if not its sweetest charms, and all was mad, feverish mirth, where fortunes were lost and won upon the green cloth in the twinkling of an eye. All classes gambled in those days, from the starch white-neckclothed professor of religion to the veriest black rascal that earned a dollar by blackening massa's boots. Nobody had leisure to think even a moment of his

occupation, and how it was viewed in Christian lands. The heated brain was never allowed to get cool, while a bit of coin or dust was left. These saloons, therefore, were crowded night and day by impatient travellers, who never could satiate themselves with excitement, nor get rid too soon of their golden heaps.'

'The world perhaps had never before seen such a spectacle, and probably nothing of the kind will be witnessed again for generations to come. Happy the man who can tell of those things which he saw, and perhaps himself did, at San Francisco at that time. He shall be an oracle to admiring neighbours. A city of twenty or thirty thousand inhabitants improvised. The people nearly all adult males, strong in person, clever, bold, sanguine, restless, and reckless.' (*Annals*, pp.215-7.)

'The people nearly all adult males.' All the features of vice, and squalor, and brutality which these few words indicate, can never be adequately portrayed, and from much which our annalists have not hesitated to place on record, the pen of the transcriber shrinks. The few miserable women who were attracted to San Francisco by the demand of the gambling houses and other places of resort, where the mad profusion of the diggings found a vent, were drawn from Mexico, from the half-breeds of the interior, the 'Kanakas' of the Sandwich Islands; many were Chinese, the most degraded of all; and not a few of the higher order of female adventurers, from more civilised regions. One of our annalists' clever woodcut illustrations, headed 'San Francisco Beauties, the Celestial, the Senora, and 'the Madame,' as they might have been seen, in 1853, perambulating the streets in common, is enough to grieve the heart of the reader when he thinks of the world of utter and hopeless wretchedness concealed beneath the dashing exteriors, thus strangely brought into contact. The mere sight of an attractive woman — the mere sound of her voice — were pleasures in those days, for which the reckless miner was ready to squander a portion of his hoard. 'Men were frequently willing to pay largely for the slight privilege of addressing one in the way of 'business.' At eating-houses, saloons, and especially gambling houses, the proprietors accordingly found that to engage a passable 'demoiselle du comptoir' was an investment profitable beyond measure; and more than one saloon girl speedily became a millionaire on her own account, either through marriage or successful speculation.

It was the result of profound meditation on this unsatisfactory state of things which induced our fair authoress, Eliza J. Farnham, to undertake that voyage to California, of which the entertaining little volume before us contains the account. Her 'explanatory preface' seems indeed, to us, to need a great deal more explana-

tion. As far as we can make out, she must be the widow of our old friend Thomas J. Farnham, Esquire, whose travels in the 'great Western Prairies' we reviewed in the year 1843. But from the circumstance that her call to visit California apparently took place on the death of that worthy person at San Francisco, in September, 1848, and from sundry allusions to cruel misconceptions, and to slanders heaped upon her 'in her official 'as well as private character;' allusions to events of which we are compelled to confess our entire ignorance—we infer that she is a 'femme incomprise,' one of the 'struggling advocates,' as she terms them, 'of woman's rights.' Be this how it may, she determined, it seems, to make the private occasion which called her to California of general use to the world. She issued a circular at New York, in which she set forth that 'among 'the many privations and deteriorating influences to which the 'thousands who are flocking thither will be subject, one of the 'greatest is the absence of woman, with all her kindly cares and 'powers, so peculiarly conservative to man under such circumstances.' She proposed, accordingly, to go out at the head of a company of women,—one hundred, or one hundred and thirty, being enough in her opinion to make the speculation of chartering a vessel a safe one,—consisting of persons 'not under 'twenty-five years of age, who shall bring from their clergyman, 'or some authority of the town where they reside, satisfactory 'testimonials of character, capacity, &c., and who can contribute 'the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars.' The stern morality which resolved to inflict on the sighing Californians none but 'persons above twenty-five years of age,' deserves particular admiration. That due care might be taken of this convoy of strong-minded, middle-aged spinsters, she farther proposed 'that the party should include six or eight respectable 'married men and their families.' We regret to say, that this project, though formally approved of by some dozen distinguished persons of the States of New York, including the respectable name of Catherine Sedgwick, and the celebrated one of the Hon. H. Greely,—proved abortive. Whether the necessity imposed on the candidate of declaring herself above twenty-five had anything to do with this result, we cannot say. But only three ladies could be procured on these terms, to rain their 'conservative influences' on the bachelors of San Francisco. Two of these, the reader will be charmed to hear, 'have 'returned with the means of living comfortably the rest of 'their days, and with unstained reputations;' the third was an inmate of Mrs. Farnham's family when she wrote.

We must not, however, part with this lady in the spirit of

sarcasm. Whatever be the merit of her speculations on the subject of woman's rights, she set about farming, as soon as she reached California, with the hearty energy of a vigorous brain and body, and with true American helpfulness and resource. Her narrative is singularly cheerful and inspiring, as well as full of valuable information: and it is with regret that we learn from the close of it that her own hopes of successful industry were crushed, through the dishonesty of an agent in San Francisco, which reduced her to ruin.

That San Francisco, and the State of which it forms the capital, should have lived through this early period of anarchy, and assumed the form of tolerably regular communities, is commonly made a ground for encomium on the self-sufficing and self-forming character of the American race. And to a certain extent the praise is well merited. Our cousins do certainly show a wonderful aptitude for 'getting on' under difficulties — for constructing a temporary machine, which shall do the day's work roughly, but successfully, in the absence of an organised polity. But it is not the less true — and the *Annals of San Francisco*, compiled by three most patriotic chroniclers, are here to testify it — that, of late years, they have lamentably failed in their attempts to organise the political system itself on a rational and solid basis. Democracy pushed to the extreme, as we now see it, seems to have two cravings which are never satisfied, — the one, for the incessant excitement of elections to all offices — the other, for assiduously disobeying, insulting, and vilifying the authorities which its own elections have established.

California became a Territory, as we have seen, in 1848, a State before the end of 1849. In the interval, the government was of course administered, according to the Constitution of the Union, by the authorities of the General Government; but Governor Riley and his subordinates appear to have refrained discreetly from taking any very active part in affairs; indeed, it has been whispered that, finding it impossible to keep an official staff together, His Honor took a turn at the diggings himself during a portion of his magistracy. But as soon as the State acquired fulness of rights, her local Constitution came into complete action. Every officer, executive and judicial alike, is eligible by the people, for a longer or shorter term of office, from the Governor down to the Comptroller, Treasurer, and Surveyor-General, and from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court down to the District Attorneys and Coroners; and the system of rotation is so ingeniously contrived

as to afford the citizens the pleasurable irritation of elections going on at all times and in all corners of the State. Moreover, the Municipal Elections of San Francisco have been from the beginning matters of still greater interest and importance, and more organised corruption, than those of the State offices themselves. We need not particularise the results. Those familiar with the workings of such institutions might easily foresee them: those who judge by the effects, may find these latter amply detailed in every account of Californian affairs.

‘Most persons thought the troubled days were past,’ says Mrs. Farnham, (after the achievements of the Vigilance Committee of 1851, of which more presently,) ‘and indeed for some time there appeared no reason to apprehend a return of them. But one bad and alarming feature was always observable,—the election of the worst men to office. I know it may be said that this is true of other States, as well as of California, and it is painful to have to confess it. But there is a broad distinction between such results in the older States and in this—a distinction which has two phases: one, viz. that such choices were much more dangerous there than elsewhere, because men in office were practically unchecked in their deeds. . . . Notwithstanding the enormous malfeasances known to have been committed, notwithstanding that the State is disgraced by a catalogue of official abuses and crimes, at which every good citizen stands aghast when they are recounted to him, there is not yet recorded one sentence of punishment upon an official offender. . . . But there was another, and, if possible, worse side to this political fact. This was, the positive and notorious foulness of the characters often chosen to fill public stations. It is often said of the candidates in our popular elections in other States, that we lose sight of fitness in choosing them, and it is too often true: but in California it has been frequently seen that gross, positive, disgraceful unfitness was the surest means of success. . . . There seemed often a systematic, deliberate choosing of the worst material offered: which is ever a fatal omen for the accomplishment of right work. . . . Our supreme Judges and Members of Congress are fair indices, on those high elevations, visible to the whole country, of what is continually happening on the lower places of public life. Be the station high or humble, the incumbent is infinitely more likely to disgrace than honour it.’ (*Mrs. Farnham*, p. 464.)

These evils are aggravated, no doubt, by the disgraceful tampering with the ballot-box which seems to have been constantly practised; but they really originated in the political recklessness of the great majority of the electors. Had they extended to the choice of legislators only, or even of executive officers, the mischief would have been comparatively trifling. The public press, which, whatever its tendency in other communities, partakes in extreme democratic societies, from the very necessity of the case, of a conservative character, helps to

keep in some kind of order the very worst specimens of elective functionaries of these classes. They are despised—and this alone is a public evil—but the extent of their power of mischief is comparatively small. But when corruption reaches the seats of judgment, and makes them its permanent abiding-place, the prospects of the community are dark indeed. If we may believe the representations before us—all by American writers—California possesses not one single tribunal, scarcely a single judge, whose character commands the slightest amount of respect. Against this evil public opinion is as powerless as any external authority. In the Union, as in England, all the regular and all the irregular machinery of government—legislative, executive, and the press itself—do but result in putting ‘twelve men into a box;’ and if these twelve men are habitually under corrupt or incapable guidance, there remains behind no power capable of controlling the evil, save one alone—the Law Martial of King Mob, popularly termed Lynch law.

The only judge who is reported to have commanded respect in California was His Honor William B. Almond; and he was appointed by the federal governor before the State was formed, not elected by the people. His Honor, at whose expense many good stories were told, ‘had a sovereign contempt,’ say the Annalists, ‘for Buncombe speeches, legal technicalities, learned opinions, and triumphantly cited precedents. He was ‘a man of quick discernment and clear judgment; and, his ‘opinion once formed—and that sometimes occurred before even ‘the first witness was fully heard—his decision was made.’

His greatest efforts were directed towards discountenancing the impositions practised on mankind by merchant skippers, against which he set his face like a flint, insonuch that at length ‘Judge Almond’s court became such a terror to merchants and captains of ships, that they would sooner compromise, even to a sacrifice, a disputed point with a sailor or passenger, than submit the case to the judgment of His Honor.’ Judge Almond’s mantle, we fear, has not fallen on his elective successors. The following is Mrs. Farnham’s account of a few of those with whom her ill fortune made her personally acquainted:—

‘One of the county judges, though well qualified for his place in point of station, ability, and cultivation, was a drunkard and debauchee: his manner of life, during the whole of his official term, was an insult to every good and self-respecting person in the community. . . . By the time his term expired, those who had helped to place him in office were heartily tired, and demanded a change of some sort. They got it. His successor is, I believe, an honest man. He would not



take a bribe, I think, nor disgrace himself or his family by any immoral act; but in a written opinion, which he rashly ventured on giving, in a case which was brought before him on appeal, he says, after giving the title of the cause, in characters which no keenness in the art of deciphering has ever rendered truly; "The coaret cred "in adgouring the caws on motion of the constable, and afterwards "trying the caws. It is tharefore ordered that the gudgement be re-verst and a new trial ordered!"' (P. 470.)

'It was his three daughters that elected him,' said a citizen, speaking of another judge, to a friend of Mrs. Farnham. The questioner looked surprised, perhaps incredulous. 'It is true,' he reiterated; 'you can see for yourself. There are a great many single men in the country, and the Judge's daughters are fine girls, though they are ignorant. I am a single man myself, and I voted for him, though I never expect one of them to marry me, and should certainly have voted for the other man if his daughters had been out of the question.'

That such judges should even ostentatiously sympathise with the public, when public feeling happens to be against the law, is matter of course. Judge Hoffman, trying Colonel H. P. Watkins, an eminent filibuster, in 1854, thus expressed himself: —

'From my heart I sympathise with the accused: but I am sworn to the execution of the law, and must discharge my duty, whatever my sympathies may be. I may admire the spirited men who have gone forth on these expeditions, to upbuild, as they claim, the broken altars, and rekindle the extinguished fires of liberty in Mexico or Lower California. It *may* be that they are *not* adventurers, gone forth to build up for themselves a cheap fortune in another land. But even were my opinion of their purposes such, and their objects as glowing and honourable as depicted by counsel, still, sitting as a Judge, I should regard only the single question, "Has the law been violated?"'

The evidence was so clear, that the jury had 'no help but to convict the accused,' who was sentenced (as was likewise his associate Major Emery) to a fine of 1500 dollars. The parties afterwards professed their inability to pay the fines. While we write, it seems a doubtful question in law, *or in fact*, whether they can be compelled either to pay them or to be imprisoned till they do so, and it is probable that neither Colonel Watkins nor Major Emery will be much troubled in the matter: 'Thus' (add our Annalists) 'are matters managed in California.'

These were trifles; but when outrage and fraud rioted unpunished throughout the Republic; when the courts of justice, instead of being the terror of criminals, had become their protection and refuge; matters grew serious, and the community began to bestir itself, in mere self-defence, against the monstrous

evils which itself had created, and was still creating, at every successive election. Another cause which seems to have contributed largely to the unpopularity of the courts, was the excessive insecurity of landed titles which prevailed, and seems still to prevail, throughout California. This is in great measure owing to the confused rules and boundaries of property prevailing among the Spanish Creoles, from whom the original Yankee purchasers derived their rights. But it has been enormously aggravated by the incapacity, or worse, of the tribunals. If the reader wishes for an example of the manner in which courts of law may play into the hands of smart speculators, he may find abundant instances in the history of California. The case of the famous 'Peter Smith titles' will furnish one easy of comprehension. Dr. Peter Smith, in 1850, contracted with the city of San Francisco to take care of its 'indigent sick,' at four dollars a head per day! The doctor performed his side of the contract faithfully; not so the city, which, having little ready cash, mostly paid him in scrip bearing a monthly interest of three per cent. In 1851 an Act was passed to convert this floating scrip into stock; but certain creditors, of whom Peter Smith was the principal, not liking the terms of conversion, went to law with the city, recovered judgment, and the doctor took in execution 'the various wharves belonging to the corporation, as also the 'old city hall lot, and the city hospital and buildings.' Meanwhile, the same property had been, as was thought, securely vested in Commissioners under the Conversion Act above mentioned. The Commissioners 'made both public and private 'statements in the strongest terms, to the effect that any sales 'which might take place under the Smith judgment would be 'illegal, and not of the smallest value.' The result of course was, that the property taken in execution was sold by the sheriff at nearly nominal prices. Again and again, therefore, Smith sued out *alias* executions, until almost the whole city property, valued at many millions of dollars, was sold in the same illusory manner to satisfy a debt of 20,000. 'At first the general public 'were inclined to treat the whole proceedings as a farce, though 'a somewhat expensive one to the purchasers at the sheriff's 'repeated sales.' But *rit bien qui rit le dernier*. To the astonishment of mankind, the Supreme Court decided 'that the 'sales of the wharves, and certain other portions of the city property, were *legal*!' The municipality was beggared. The citizens were taxed to supply the deficiency. The 'nominal 'purchasers' realised enormous fortunes—and the tribunal?

'It may not be easy,' say our discreet Annalists, 'to discover and brand the guilty persons, and people may entertain different sus-

pitions as to their names and special concern in the grand game of spoliation. Let every one, therefore, keep his own thoughts on the business. . . . One thing seems certain; the "manifest destiny" of San Francisco is to be plundered at all hands, and to yield easy and quickly won fortunes to her "prominent citizens."

Desperate cases require heroic remedies, and the disorders of the Californian bench have had the result of producing, perhaps, the most remarkable and systematic applications of Lynch Law to the body politic, which have taken place since the old German *Vehngericht* became obsolete.

In 1849 the citizens of San Francisco had improvised a police of their own, to put down an association of disturbers of the public peace called the 'Hounds,' distinguished particularly by their outrages on the wretched women who then frequented the streets. This was succeeded in 1851, by the famous 'Vigilance Committee.' The state of San Francisco in that year was peculiarly frightful; and 'the law, whose supposed majesty is so awful in other countries, was only a matter of ridicule.' Incendiary fires—the most disorganising to society of all calamities, from the terrible suspicions they excite—began to be more than ever the subject of nightly dread. 'It was at this fearful time that the Vigilance Committee was organised.' A number of leading citizens bound themselves by a written constitution for the protection of life and property. A room was selected, at which one or more members of the Committee were to be in constant attendance, at all hours of the day or night, to receive reports of acts of violence. If, in the judgment of the attending member, the case was clear enough for action, he was to summon the Committee by 'two strokes on a bell, to be repeated 'with a pause of one minute between each alarm.'

A few days after its appointment, the Committee seized, tried, and condemned to death, a 'Sydney Cove,' of the name of Jenkins, for stealing a safe. The city authorities were 'civilly desired to stand back' while the culprit was hanged, by a rope thrown over a projecting beam in the Plaza. A coroner's verdict found that he 'died by strangulation, at the hands of, and 'in pursuance of a preconcerted action on the part of, an association of citizens styling themselves a Committee of Vigilance,' of whom it proceeded to name a certain number. The entire Committee, including 'some of the richest, most influential, 'orderly, and respectable citizens,' immediately assumed, with impunity, the public responsibility of the act, and proceeded to execute their summary jurisdiction in other cases. This first serious collision with the so-called authorities was in the case of Whittaker and Mackenzie, whom they had found guilty of

various acts of burglary, robbery, and arson, and sentenced to death. The Governor of the State now interfered. The sheriff, 'holding a warrant of habeas corpus,' proceeded to the Committee-room, and rescued the condemned wretches. The Committee were soon summoned by the ominous alarm 'on the 'monumental engine bell' They broke into the gaol—the slight defence of the gaolers and guards was of no avail. Mackenzie and Whittaker were seized again, and duly suspended from the windows of the Committee-room, 'the loose ends of 'the halters being taken within the building itself, and forcibly 'held by members of the Committee.' The coroner's inquest was held as usual, and, as usual, no steps were taken on it by the frightened 'authorities.' Branch Vigilance Committees were formed all over the State. Unknown numbers of malefactors were hanged\*, flogged, or branded, or served with a polite notice to quit the State; and 'the land had rest for five 'years.'

But by 1856, the work had to be begun afresh. This time the re-organised Vigilance Committee had not merely to put down criminal outrages, but to do battle with the gross political corruption which was supposed to engender and encourage them.

'Whereas,' says their constitution, 'it has become apparent to the citizens of San Francisco, that there is no security for life and property, either under the regulations of society as it at present exists, or under the laws as now administered; and that by the association together of bad characters, our ballot-boxes have been stolen, and others substituted, or stuffed with votes that were never polled, and thereby our elections nullified, our dearest rights violated, and no other method left by which the will of the people can be manifested: therefore'

the old Committee of Public Safety was renewed, with greater solemnity than before. This time, however, the 'authorities' interfered in earnest. David Terry, Judge of the Supreme Court, issued a habeas corpus in the case of one Milligan, a prisoner for robbery and election fraud in the Committee's rooms. And the governor proclaimed San Francisco in a state of insurrection, and proceeded to raise men on the side of 'law and order;' low

---

\* One of these improvised executions was witnessed by a friend of Mrs. Farnham. 'Not knowing any one, and wishing to have the 'criminal pointed out to him, he inquired of a person who was standing 'a little apart, which was the man they were to hang; to which he 'replied, without the slightest change of countenance, "I believe it's 'me, sir!" Half-an-hour after, he was suspended from the bough of 'a tree, and the little community dispersed without the smallest 'demonstration.' (P. 317.)

people all, we are told; nicknamed 'law and murder-men' by the friends of the Committee; and oddly designated by Mr. Seyd as 'a gang of meddling politicians, jesuits, demagogues, and ballot-box stuffers.' The Committee, representing, it should seem, the conservative interest, pursued the even tenor of its way, in utter disregard of such feeble assailants. 'Embodied in the principles of republican government,' they declared, 'are the truths that the majority should rule; and when corrupt officials, who have fraudulently seized the reins of authority, designedly thwart the execution of the laws, and avert punishment from the notoriously guilty, the power they usurp reverts back to the people from whom it was wrested.' Up to the 20th of June they had disposed of twenty-six persons, of whom 'three were *dead*' (hanged?), and the remainder banished: declared guilty of 'being notoriously bad characters and dangerous persons, disturbers of the peace, and violators of the purity and integrity of the ballot-box.' Notices to this effect were served on every person sentenced to banishment, sealed with an Eye, the symbol of the Committee. At last a 'difficulty' took place, in which Judge Terry stabbed one Hopkins, a member of the Committee's police. In a few minutes between three and four thousand citizens were in arms; the partisans of 'Law and Murder' were besieged and disarmed: Judge Terry clapt into prison, but afterwards liberated contemptuously. The triumph of the Committee was complete. Having thoroughly purged the community, it surrendered its power; and so ended, for the time, a revolution which, in the opinion of Mrs. Farnham, 'has furnished, both in its progress and completion, the grandest and most satisfactory testimony to the capacity of the Americans for self-government.'

These, however, (so philosophers of the sanguine class will assure us) are but passing clouds, obscuring slightly the magnificent prospect of Californian advance: the substantial truth to be noticed is, that amidst political institutions rotting prematurely under general contempt, and a people determined to be bound by no laws or legislature, even of their own creation, the great work of colonisation and improvement goes on as prosperously as it could have done under the most perfect of Utopias. How far the physical well-being of man may be admitted to counterbalance moral and political corruption, we will not now inquire. We fear there is a readier answer. California, with all her present advantages, and certain as she is of ultimate prosperity, is nevertheless by no means 'progressing' in the ratio which was at first expected, and to which she is in truth entitled. Do what she will, she cannot attract immigration to

her shores, now that the gold-fever has for the present passed away. She does not afford a field of labour attractive to the civilised and orderly portion of mankind. The first check to her astonishing career was given in 1851, when the discovery of gold in Australia carried off at once a considerable part of her restless mining population. Many of them no doubt returned, disheartened by their ill success in a region where, though the deposits are somewhat richer than in California, the labour of extraction is said to be somewhat greater; others, as our Annalists have the audacity to declare, 'disgusted with the *moral contamination* of working beside the convicts of Van Diemen's 'Land and New South Wales.' Still, the drain westward on the whole continued, and has constituted ever since a serious drawback. California, at the close of 1853, contained about 350,000 inhabitants, of whom about one-fifth were females. In the last three years, according to Mr. Seyd, she has received 'scarcely any addition to her population.' The stream of emigration seems, for the present, to have been effectually diverted across the Pacific. Mr. Seyd's book is written expressly for the purpose of restoring it to his own State; and in a region where, as he tells us, 'Many a maid-of-all-work, or 'scullery-maid, receives as high a salary as a judge in Germany; 'many a negro gets as much as a major or colonel in the 'Prussian service; and errand boys of ten years of age earn 'more than double the pay of an European lieutenant of the line,' this should seem no such difficult task: nevertheless the fact is otherwise; even to the roughest class of immigrants there are some general wants beyond those of mere nature; and they, too, have a sense that security, order, and civilisation are not objects of entire indifference. Social improvement has, we believe, begun; but years must elapse before California redeems her character from the memories of stuffed ballot-boxes, Vigilance Committees, and respectable citizens pulling at one end of a rope which was strangling some wretched being, murdered under the hap-hazard verdict of a Lynch jury.

The sensitive minds of the Californian diggers, we have seen, shrank from the 'moral contamination' of Australia. Abhorring in general all comparisons raised merely for the purpose of flattering the self-love of one people at the expense of another, we cannot resist the temptation to note, in answer to this sarcasm, the contrast afforded by the respective histories of the State and the Colony under destinies so strangely similar. When the wealth of the diggings of Victoria was first noised abroad, that province, a mere offset of New South Wales, was circumstanced much as California had been: her plains partially occu-

pied by a few thousand 'squatters' and dependents. The rush to the diggings was, 'if possible, even more violent, the excitement madder, than in California herself. And it was fearfully aggravated by the presence of large numbers of runaway convicts, or scarcely less dreaded 'expirces and ticket-of-leave men,' flocking in from the quondam prison-settlements of the neighbourhood. Every one conjectured, and not unnaturally, that the scenes of the Sacramento were to be repeated with new varieties of extravagant lawlessness, on the slopes of Ballarat and Bendigo. But the fact turned out far otherwise. There was no doubt a considerable amount of crime and violence; one serious insurrection, some sanguinary riots; but the still, regular voice of old English law and order was heard throughout. The true conservative element of society, reverence for established institutions, insignificant in themselves, but most significant as parts of a whole, carried the community safely through a struggle of unparalleled intensity. The tribunals continued their steady-working throughout, never silenced, corrupted, or intimidated; never, so far as we know, even suspected. Except in a few insulated cases, there was no recourse to irregular popular justice; it was felt that no such recourse was needed. Legal redress was never far to seek, nor unsafe to rely on, though temporary difficulties might for a while impede its attainment. Victoria is three years younger (in her auriferous character) than California. Her produce of gold is not larger. She is a less fertile, picturesque and attractive region. Yet her population already amounts to 450,000, of whom one-third are females; still a serious, but not unmanageable disproportion. Though she draws her supplies of people, on the whole, from more distant sources and by more costly routes, yet, as Mr. Seyd confesses, she is 'constantly supplied with large numbers of emigrants of all classes: foreign capital is abundant and cheap, and all enterprises encouraged to their utmost extent.' In respect of moral and social advance, we will institute no invidious comparison between the two: we will merely state, that notwithstanding the mass of quondam convicts supposed to be established in Victoria, the 'total number of persons under police surveillance' was reported in December last not to exceed 934.

What are the causes of a difference so marked in the recent fortunes of these sister regions? We will suggest only two, and leave them to the judgment of our readers. The first is, the different management of the public lands. While those of California have been from the beginning the prize of clever speculation, yielding absolutely nothing to the State and contri-

buting in no degree to its public purposes, the gold discoveries found those of Victoria strictly tied up under the almost pedantic restrictions of the Wakefield system, adopted, it need not be said, with a view to a wholly different state of things. Half the proceeds of her enormous land sales were regularly remitted to England, and spent under 'Act of Parliament by three commissioners sitting in London, but spent in supplying the colony, under strict regulations, with the very thews and sinews of her future people, with numbers of stout agricultural settlers, women especially, as the need of females was greatest; settlers of a class the most valuable of all to the colony, and whom their own unassisted exertions could not possibly have conveyed there. Between 1851 and 1857 the commissioners sent out in round numbers 30,000 male and 50,000 female emigrants. The local government has now possession of the land revenue, but seems disposed to spend it with due regard to the lessons of former experience. This was a case, — a rare one, we must, of course, admit, — in which red-tape succeeded where the favourite principles of modern days, Let-alone and Go-ahead, must have inevitably and signally failed.

The second cause was, and is, difference of government. The people of Victoria may boast themselves as free as those of any commonwealth under the sun: they are self-governed, in the only sense worthy of the name, making through their representatives their own laws and managing their own finances. But throughout the period of their trial, and indeed up to this day, they have been under executive officers ultimately dependent on the people, but not directly chosen by the people, and therefore untouched by that contempt which the multitude so capriciously attaches, elsewhere, to the temporary favourites of its own ballot-box. And, what is of far more importance, their judges have been throughout appointed, after the good old European fashion, by the supreme executive authority, and practically for life. The head of the government, with little direct power but much personal influence, has been the representative of the parent State, free from the local passions of the community; and there has been in the distance the shadow of the Crown. Let those who will dispute the efficacy of these causes; we can at all events point with confidence to the result: the younger of the two golden sisters, and the less favoured in natural gifts, has for the present outstripped the elder one, and seems likely to continue to do so.



- ART. II.—1. *A History of the Church of Russia.* By A. N. MOURAVIEFF. Translated by the Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE, B.A. Oxford: 1842.
2. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church.* By the Rev. JOHN MASON NEALE, M.A. \* General Introduction and Patriarchate of Alexandria. 4 vols. London: 1848–51.
3. 'Ο Συνοδικὸς Τόμος, ἡ περὶ Ἀληθείας. Athens; 1852.
4. *Dissertations on Subjects relating to the 'Orthodox' or 'Eastern Catholic' Communion.* By WILLIAM PALMER, M. A. London: 1853.
5. *Papal Aggression in the East: or the Protestantism of the Oriental Churches.* Edinburgh: 1856.
6. Περὶ Δογμάτων, Διοικήσεως καὶ Ἱεουργιῶν τῆς Ἀγγλικῆς Ἐκκλησιᾶς Πονημάτων Κοσίνου Ἐπισκόπου Δυνέλμου, κ.τ.λ. ἐκδιδοντας Φρεδερίκου Μερρίκου, T. Δ. Oxford: 1856.

THE existence of the Eastern Church is one of the great phenomena of history. Like the empire with which its destinies were for so many ages inseparably connected, it stands outside the ordinary field either of historical study or of theological controversy. The Orthodox Church and the Byzantine Empire, the Greek religion and the Greek nation, derive their importance from the very circumstances which have led to their general neglect. While new nations and new languages appeared, one after another, on the theatre of Western Europe; while new forms alike of freedom and of slavery were developed; while feudal sovereignty and civic republicanism arose and fell; while all the elements of the modern world were gradually called into being;—the ancient life of Greece and Rome still lingered on by the shores of the Bosphorus; Roman Cæsars still retained their unbroken succession from Constantine and Augustus, and Greek historians still chronicled their deeds in a language hardly changed from that of Xenophon and Demosthenes. So too, while the ecclesiastical world has been shaken by the disputes of Catholic and Protestant, and by the internal schisms which have disturbed either fold, the Holy Orthodox Apostolic Eastern Church has stood majestically by, unmoved by the contentions of either disputant, a witness for and against both of them alike. After ages of controversy and warfare, sometimes persecuting, sometimes persecuted, the tyrant of the Monophysite and the Paulician, the victim of the

Catholic and the Moslem, the Orthodox Church, as she loves to style herself, still remains unchanged and unchangeable, still preserving the creed and ritual and discipline of ages before Western controversies were heard of. She, and not her Western rival, is the true 'semper eadem;' she, with her ancient patriarchal thrones witnessing alike for hierarchical order and against Papal usurpation—with the pomp and ceremony of her immemorial liturgies, untainted by the worst of Rome's doctrinal corruptions—honouring the monastic life, and yet not imposing celibacy on her secular clergy—,vying with Rome in reverence for the eucharistic rite, and yet administering it unmutilated to all her children—such a Church, the truest representative on earth of the old days of Fathers and of Councils, is the standing difficulty of Catholic and Protestant alike. Nothing is easier than for the one side to pass her by as 'corrupt,' for the other to brand her as 'schismatic.' To the charge of schism, her existence is sufficient reply; that fact alone disproves the claims of Rome to universal empire. Practically corrupt indeed she well may be, after ages of overweening prosperity succeeded by ages of grinding oppression. Yet, at least from an Anglican or Lutheran point of view, it would be hard to show that she has erred in more than one formal article of doctrine, in more than one important article of practice. She denies the double Procession; she allows and recommends Invocation of Saints. And, in the practice of her members, this latter speculative tenet degenerates into a superstitious reverence for likenesses traced by art and man's device. But the former strictly theological question is indeed one to which but few Protestants of the present day really attach any meaning. Day after day, month after month\*, we are content to recite her creeds, and to denounce her anathemas against heresies of which many of us have forgotten the existence. Add to this that neither Roman nor Protestant Christendom has borne the same fiery trial on behalf of the Christian faith. Through a large portion of her communion, her existence for ages past has been one long martyrdom. Throughout vast provinces, every one of her members has been entitled to the rank of confessor. Every man, from the Tigris to the Danube, who has remained faithful to her, has incurred the certainty of civil degradation, the chance of spoliation, bonds, or death. And all this has been endured

---

\* The so-called Athanasian Creed, the fullest and most scientific exposition of the Catholic theology, is, in its existing shape, a Latin production, but every one of its definitions, every one of the errors it anathematises, is of eastern origin.

in defence of a discipline which is the standing reproof of the pretensions of the Vatican, in defence of a creed which, in the nostrils of Exeter Hall, is no less unsavoury than that of the Vatican itself. Truly, both for Catholic and Protestant controversialists, by far the most convenient way is entirely to forget the existence of the Eastern Church, just as so many historical students and teachers find it convenient entirely to forget the existence of the Eastern Empire.

To one party alone among Protestants does the Orthodox Church commonly appear as an object of attraction. The High Church section of the English Church take a natural interest in a communion which, like their own, protests against the usurpations of Rome, while it sympathises with their special views of ritual and discipline, of sacramental efficacy and episcopal government. It is not, however, from a High Church, or from any strictly theological point of view, that we propose to consider the history and characteristics of the Orthodox Church. Many of our conclusions will be equally reprobated by Pope and Patriarch, while, even among ourselves, it is only from the 'Broad' section of our brethren that our general scope is likely to meet with much favour. At the same time we must express our obligations to several divines of the extreme High Church school for the labour which they have bestowed in elucidating a subject which to them had naturally a peculiar charm. Our object is different from theirs, but we are indebted to them for no little incidental help. Our thanks are especially due to Mr. Palmer and Mr. Neale, for the works which we have placed at the head of this article. To these we may add Mr. Blackmore's translation of Mouravieff's History of the Russian Church, which seems to have been made with a similar theological purpose. And, while we write, we are rejoiced to find that the subject of the Eastern Church has at last commended itself to a writer of a widely different school. Mr. Arthur Stanley, now Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, has selected its fortunes as the theme of one of his earliest courses of lectures. From one of Mr. Stanley's known research, candour, and power of language, as well as from his recent personal acquaintance with the metropolitan Prelates and Doctors of the Church of Moscow, great things may be expected. We trust that his lectures, on a subject with which he is so well qualified to deal, may not be confined to his hearers in the Clarendon or the Theatre, but may become, in a printed shape, a permanent portion of our ecclesiastical literature.

Both Mr. Neale and Mr. Palmer made themselves a considerable name in the Tractarian movement; and like most

of the persons so engaged, they have done themselves, in the way of popular reputation, considerable injustice. The weak and foolish side of their character always prominently presents itself, while its more respectable elements seldom penetrate beyond the limits of their own party. Mr. Neale and Mr. Palmer have both written a very large amount of nonsense, and yet both of them are possessed of a very large amount of ability. Mr. Palmer used to proclaim himself a 'Fellow of St. Mary 'Magdalene College, and Deacon in the Church of England.' In the former capacity he gained a high reputation for academical scholarship; in the latter he wandered up and down the earth in search of Catholic Communion, and, at last, after various adventures among the Orthodox in Greece and Russia, he ended his career by the commonplace termination of, prostrating himself at the feet of the Western Antichrist. His book on the Orthodox Communion is really the most extraordinary mixture of wisdom and folly which we ever remember to have come across. Some portions read like the production of a sage, others like that of an idiot. It is in fact an instructive commentary on the condition of a naturally acute and thoughtful mind when habitually bowed down by the rigid trammels of a formal theory. Some of the early chapters exhibit a considerable amount of the historic faculty, which their author would have done well to have cultivated. He everywhere grasps the respective positions of the Eastern and Western Churches with vigour and acuteness. Strangely contrasted with all this is his pitiful rubbish on the theory of government, a mere abject defence of despotism, and the hopeless nonsense about the Seven Churches and their mystical meanings with which the volume concludes. On the whole, the book is likely to be attractive only to a small class of readers, but it should certainly not be passed by by any who wish to become acquainted with the subject of the Oriental Church.

Mr. Neale's book, as yet unfinished, aspires to a higher position than Mr. Palmer's,—to that of a standard history. The merits and defects of the work are exactly the reverse of what we should have expected from the other writings of its author. Mr. Neale has poured forth a profusion of tales and poems on historical subjects, all pleasantly but superficially written—hasty, vigorous, fluent, narrow-minded, bitter, and unfair. His *Magnum Opus* is composed in much worse English and in a much more candid spirit than was promised by any of his smaller productions. His comments, of course, reflect the rigid dogmatism of his party; but comments need not be accepted by the reader, and his statements of fact do not seem to be at all warped.

He tells us that A was a saint and that B was a heretic; but he does not disguise either the vices of A or the virtues of B. He swallows Orthodox miracles and doubts Jacobite ones; but he does not conceal the fact that the evidence is equally good or bad in both cases. He does not deny that many heretics died for the name of Christ at the hands of Mahometan tyrants; he only doubts whether the title of martyr can be rightly given to any who do not keep the Catholic faith whole and undefiled. In his smaller writings Mr. Neale is always interesting, but commonly careless and romantic; in his great work he is eminently learned, patient, sober, and, we must add, dull. But, like many writers of his class, he is apt to stumble when he deserts his own immediate path. Gibbon says of Justinian that his last years were devoted to heavenly contemplation, and that he neglected the affairs of this lower world. A similar malady not unfrequently besets ecclesiastical writers; and we see the results when, from the affairs of patriarchates and dioceses, they occasionally condescend to turn to those of commonwealths and empires. One portentous blunder we have found in this author, which really is inexcusable in a historian of the Holy Eastern Church. Mr. Neale tells us (*Patr. of Alex.* vol. ii. p. 361.):---

‘Sigismund III., King of Poland, was a member of the Roman Church; *whereas his predecessors had constantly adhered to the Oriental Faith.*’

We should really have thought it needless to tell any one who professed to know that Poland and Russia ever had a history, that not only Sigismund III., but all his predecessors since the introduction of Christianity into Poland in the tenth century, had constantly adhered to the Occidental Faith. A blunder hardly less astounding occurs in p. 267. of the General Introduction:— ‘At that time (1003) Basil II. and Constantine IX. were in the middle of their long and *peaceful* reign.’ Possibly ‘peaceful’ is to be taken in some special ecclesiastical sense, absence from the scourge of heresy or the inroads of schism; but if it has reference to carnal and bodily conflicts, we can only say that we must be strangely at variance with Mr. Neale either in our idea of peace or in our idea of the ‘Slayer of the Bulgarians.’

Our own more immediate object is to contemplate the Orthodox Church in its political and national, rather than in its strictly theological aspect. We shall have a good deal to say about the Papal Supremacy, but not much about the Double Procession, and still less about the controversy on Azymes. We wish to regard the Churches of the East chiefly as witnesses to the position that a Church may be strictly national, admitting no foreign jurisdiction, and yet retain the fullest intercom-

munion with the equally independent Churches of other nations. The Orthodox Church contains peoples, nations, and languages, of various origins, under various governments, and in various stages of civilisation. Greeks, Roumans, Slaves, Georgians, are bound together by the tie of a common faith and worship, not by common subjection to any one central power. Each nation worships God in its own language; each, when subject to a Christian Government, has its national Church Establishment, independent of any foreign authority. Scattered over so large a portion of the globe, and held together by no compulsory tie, the members of the Orthodox Church are at least as closely united by the bonds of Christian fellowship as the members of the Latin Church are by the bonds of a common submission to the Roman Pontiff. We are not aware of more than one controversy which divides them, and that one has not led to any breach of communion. The Greeks reject the baptism of other Christian sects; the Russians, in a spirit at once more liberal and more conformable to primitive practice, admit it. What is specially remarkable is that the Orthodox Church should have succeeded in thoroughly identifying herself with the national life of so many distinct races. Greek by origin, she has not remained Greek in the same way that the Western Church has remained Roman. She neither forces on other nations the use of the Hellenic language, nor requires any absolute submission to a Byzantine Pope. Occasionally, indeed, both in Byzantine and Ottoman times, the Slavonic inhabitants of the empire have had reason to complain that their ecclesiastical interests have been sacrificed to those of the dominant and more enlightened Greek. Similar complaints have often been made, with the like reason, by the Welsh and Irish members of our own communion. But, in either case, it is a mere passing evil of detail, not implying any vice in the system. To this day the Orthodox Church is equally national in the Russian Empire and in the Greek kingdom, though both are alike independent of the œcumenical throne of Constantinople. In all this the Orthodox Church is most strikingly contrasted with the Churches of the Western obedience. With them the one great and primary bond is not community of worship, or even of faith, but common submission to an external head. The Roman Church can never be strictly national; her members, and still more her ministers, must ever bear a divided allegiance. The Orthodox Church is the greatest existing witness to the principle that national independence and religious intercommunion are in no way inconsistent. It may even afford a good hope that such a state of things, surely the highest ecclesiastical ideal on earth,

may some day have still more extended application among the now divided branches of the Universal Church.

This character of the Eastern Church is the more remarkable and the more honourable, when we consider the history of her development as a distinct form of Christianity. The circumstances of her origin might well have inspired the idea that the Orthodox Church could never be anything but a Greek Church. The Orthodox Church and the modern Greek nation were produced and fostered by the same set of circumstances. The Orthodox Church, moreover, grew up under the shadow of a despotism, in its origin the most unnatural of any, that of the Cæsars of the New Rome. For a considerable time it was nowhere willingly accepted except where the sway of those Cæsars was willingly accepted also. It might have appeared unable to maintain its existence beyond the jurisdiction of the Byzantine Emperor and the Byzantine Patriarch. At the very least it might have been deemed that those who accepted it would have to merge their language and nationality in that of the neo-Hellenes, the self-styled Romans. Such would have been no unreasonable fear, but the vast empire of Russia, the large Slavonic population of Turkey, the kingdom of Georgia, so long both independent and Orthodox, are living witnesses to its non-fulfilment.

The origin of the Greek Church and of the Greek nation was, as we have said, identical. In one sense the church created the nation; in another, the nation created the church. In the East indeed, religion and nationality are commonly identical. This notion influences the commonest forms of speech. A Roman Catholic Englishman is still an Englishman; a Protestant Frenchman is still a Frenchman. But when a Jew or a Turk enters the Christian pale, we hardly continue to call him a Jew or a Turk. There have been many Moslems of Hellenic blood, but we should hardly venture to apply the name of Greek to a believer in the Prophet. It forms part of the idea of a Greek that he should be an Orthodox Christian; part of the idea of a Turk that he should be a Sonnite Mussulman. Copt, Armenian, Parsee, and Hindoo, are strictly terms of ethnology, but the notion which they convey is one much more of religious than of national distinction. The ordinary course is for a religion to be first formed by the working of the national mind, and then to be adopted as the easiest definition of nationality. The instincts and tendencies of a race lead it either to adopt a distinct creed of its own or to modify the creed of another nation into a distinct form. In the East it is seldom that a nation can openly assert its distinct political existence. Its distinctive religion is commonly assumed

as its outward badge. But, if circumstances are favourable, the religious body thus formed may acquire a political being, and may again become a nation. In such a state of things religious proselytism and civil naturalisation are one and the same thing. The first Mahometan conquests seemed to have spread the nationality as well as the religion of Arabia from the Indus to the Atlantic. And in many countries the two were lastingly established together. But the vigorous nationality of Persia refused an absolute submission to either. She adopted Mahometanism, but she gradually moulded it into forms suited to the tendencies of the national mind. The Persian nation thus formed the Shiah sect. But, in return, the Shiah sect formed the Persian nation. Its doctrines became a national badge, round which the national sentiment gathered. The sect grew into an empire, and the Arabian and Turkish elements which existed in the country were incorporated into a new Persian nation. Similarly the tendencies of the Greek mind produced the distinctive character of the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox Church in return became the distinctive badge of the Greek nation. And as Arabian and Turkish elements coalesced with the neo-Persian being of modern Iran, so large Albanian and Slavonian elements have been incorporated into the neo-Hellenic being of modern Greece.

How then did a church so closely connected with the existence of a single nation obtain the power of becoming so thoroughly naturalised in other countries? It was the result of several circumstances in its position and policy which we may consider a little more at length. In tracing out the origin of the Orthodox Church as a distinct form of Christianity, we shall easily see why its introduction was impossible in some regions and easy in others; why it has ever remained foreign and hostile to the Syrian and the Egyptian, while the Servian and the Russian have accepted it with no less fervour than the Greek himself.

The Byzantine Empire and the Orthodox Church were created by the same process. For some time the Roman Empire and the Catholic Church were coextensive; and to this day Christendom is nearly coextensive with those countries which either formed part of the Roman Empire or were once civilised and evangelised by its inhabitants. But, within the Roman Empire, within the Catholic Church, there gradually arose the great division into East and West. The Greek and the Latin provinces split off into rival empires and rival churches. In the farther East, the Syrian and Egyptian provinces, which had never been really incorporated into the Roman Empire, fell off from all allegiance, temporal or spiritual, either to the Old or the New Rome. Meanwhile, both in the East and West, new



racés of meh were coming within the sphere both of the church and the empire, in a character strangely compounded of conquerors and disciples. Thus there arose a Western Empire, with its Western, Latin, or Catholic Church, with its half oppressor, half pupil, the Teuton. Thus, too, there arose an Eastern Empire, with its Eastern, Greek, or Orthodox Church, with its half oppressor, half pupil, the Slave.

The Byzantine Empire and the Orthodox Church, as we find them fully developed between the seventh and eleventh centuries, were thus the result of a triple series of events. The Oriental provinces were violently dismembered; the Latin provinces gradually fell off. The residuum left by their loss was nearly coextensive with that artificial Greek nation, Church, and Empire, which, in the two former characters, is still living and vigorous. But the Orthodox Church, thus closely united in its origin with the Byzantine Empire, did not remain confined within the limits of Byzantine political authority. It did, however, remain, and it still remains, confined within the limits of Byzantine moral influence. Numerically viewed, it has been, for ages past, essentially a Slavonic Church. Morally and intellectually, it always has been, and probably always will be, a Greek Church. To the Eastern Slaves the New Rome was the centre of civilisation, just as Old Rome was to the Teutons. Bulgaria, Servia, Russia, have often been the political enemies, but they have always been the intellectual disciples, of the Empire and Church of Constantinople.

We shall therefore consider, in their historical order, the three processes which led to the formation of the Orthodox Church as a distinct form of Christianity.

1st. The loss of the heretical churches of the East.

2nd. The separation from Latin Christendom.

3rd. The conversion of the Eastern Slaves.

The East was from the beginning the fruitful birthplace of heresy, because it was the native seat of abstract speculation. Through the whole compass of ecclesiastical history, Eastern controversies are speculative, while Western controversies are practical.\* Eastern disputes are purely theological; Western

---

\* The only strictly theological controversy which seems to have permanently affected the West, is that which has gone on, in one form or another, from the days of Pelagius, to our own. But even this is something quite different from the Nestorian or Monophysite dispute. It is not a merely speculative question as to the nature of the Deity, but one which, indirectly at least, is highly practical, and affects the character of His dealings with mankind.

disputes are of that mixed character which we call ecclesiastical. The difference is shown in the favourite designations of the two great Churches. The East glories in its Orthodoxy; the West in its Catholicity. The West is only Orthodox because it is Catholic; discipline comes first and dogma second. An infallible tribunal precludes dogmatic error; only obey the right person, and you will be sure to believe the right thing. The East measures Catholicity by Orthodoxy; dogma comes first, discipline is something very secondary. Rome tolerates the omission of the *Filioque*, if you admit the supremacy of the Pope; Constantinople will not endure the *Filioque*, but is careless about submission to the Patriarch. It was then in the eastern division of the empire, above all in Egypt, that the early theological controversies arose. The four Eastern Patriarchates were rent in pieces by them; but the Pontiff of the West merely stepped in as an arbiter, using every Eastern controversy as a step towards the foundation of his Western Empire. The only controversy which seriously affected the West was the first and greatest of all. And this is a most distinct case of the exception proving the rule. Arianism survived among the Teutonic converts in Italy, Spain, and Africa after it was forgotten in the East. But Arianism was of Egyptian origin, and the Teutonic converts embraced it at a time when their sojourn on the lower Danube brought them within the sphere of eastern influences. The Goths and Vandals retained Arianism as the form of Christianity to which they were originally converted, but the Roman inhabitants of the West never adopted it, and they ultimately won over their conquerors.

In the East no permanent Arian Church was founded. Arianism failed to connect itself with the national life of any eastern people. But the case was widely different with the controversies of the next century. The disputes which led to the assembling of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon have had most permanent results on both the religious and the political history of the East. These controversies, like that commenced by Arius, were so far from being Latin that they were not, in their origin, even Greek. Their native regions were Syria and Egypt; the Old and the New Rome alike heard of them only to condemn them. If Nestorianism was first openly preached by a Byzantine patriarch, it was by one who had only just been translated from the Syrian Antioch. The great enemy of Nestorius was the Alexandrine Cyril, whose own teaching became the groundwork of the next heresy, that of the Monophysites. Neither doctrine obtained any currency beyond the limits of the three Oriental Patriarchates. But, within

their limits, one or other of them became the national faith of the native Christians.

The fact is that these ecclesiastical controversies were simply the form which the circumstances and feelings of the age could hardly fail to give to controversies essentially national and political. The Roman Empire would have been most naturally divided into three portions; the actual political division was into two. The Latin, the Greek, and the Oriental provinces would have formed three natural groups. But the tendency of the fourth and fifth centuries was to place two imperial colleagues over the Latin and the Greek provinces respectively, subordinating the Orientals to the Greeks. Thus, while the rest of the empire suffered merely the loss of political liberty, Syria and Egypt had to complain of actual national subjection. In Western Europe all the nations within the empire were thoroughly Latinised; in Eastern Europe and Western Asia they were somewhat less completely Hellenised. Here and there some semi-barbarous tribe might retain its ancient language; but every civilised man gloried in the title of Roman, and spoke the tongue either of Rome or of Greece. From the Atlantic to Mount Taurus no province voluntarily fell away either from the Roman Empire or from the Catholic Church. Separation from either was invariably the work of barbarian immigrants.

But beyond Mount Taurus, in the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the case was widely different. The Syrian and Egyptian people were never either Latinised or Hellenised. Alexandria and Antioch were for a long time the greatest of Greek cities; but they always remained Greek colonies in a foreign land. And when Constantinople became the great centre of Greek intellect and Roman dominion, Antioch and Alexandria themselves became somewhat less Hellenic, and more entitled to speak in the name of their respective provinces. Egypt, above all, as it was one of the latest, was one of the most precarious, of all the acquisitions of Rome. Both there and in Syria the natives chafed under the yoke, but could not throw it off. Ages of foreign despotism had rendered them utterly incapable of military or political action. One field alone remained where they might still continue to assert their national independence in a new form. Ecclesiastical controversy formed the intellectual food of the age. Intellects therefore, which, under other circumstances, might have triumphed in the senate-house or on the field of battle, now became the leaders of ecclesiastical sects, the orators of the pulpit, the victors in provincial or œcumenical councils. Men had no longer a country or a faction; but they could still argue, per-

secrete, suffer, sometimes actually fight, on behalf of a theological dogma. The dissatisfied national mind, lacking physical vigour to venture on rebellion, had full scope to assert its independence in the shape of heresy. As in later times the Greeks, under Moslem or Catholic bondage, consoled themselves by remaining Orthodox, so the Egyptians, under the bondage of Orthodox Byzantium, consoled themselves by becoming Monophysites.

We remarked above that Eastern controversies are commonly speculative, while Western ones are commonly practical. The controversies with which we are at present dealing are the most speculative and the least practical of any about which men ever anathematised one another. They are theological questions in the strictest sense, disputes on points relating to the Divine Nature, which it was alike impossible for any of the disputants to understand. It does not appear that the men who tore one another to pieces about Natures, Persons, and Wills, differed upon any one intelligible point. We imagine that Cyril and Nestorius had both of them exactly the same practical faith in a divine Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, which is shared with them by millions who never heard of the doctrines of either. Each, we imagine, held the same hope, prayed for the same grace, expected salvation through the same sacrifice. Only they used different *words* about inscrutable mysteries,—words which had themselves first to be defined before any man knew whether he were orthodox or heterodox in using them. Even among speculative orientals, it is hard to understand how such intense enthusiasm could have been exhibited on behalf of a mere abstract formula, unless some more intelligible cause of controversy lay behind. But such intelligible cause is at once supplied, if we look upon the theological dispute as the only available way of expressing national enmity.

The first movement came from Syria. Nestorius, the Antiochene Patriarch of Constantinople, first broached the heresy which bears his name,—that which regards the Godhead and Manhood of Christ as two distinct persons, and which therefore refuse to the Virgin the title of *Θεοτόκος*. In the Council of Ephesus a whole band of Syrian Bishops embraced his cause, while Egypt was foremost in the assault upon him, and Rome and Constantinople united in his condemnation. But the orthodox fervour of Egypt was of short duration. The attack on Nestorius was led by Cyril of Alexandria, one of the marvels of hagiology. It is certainly difficult, on ordinary moral grounds, to recognise much sanctity in this turbulent prelate, the accessory after the fact in the murder of Hypatia.

And to a non-theological eye it is hardly easier to distinguish between his position and teaching, canonised and orthodox Doctor as he is, and that of his heretical successors in the same see. Historically, there can be no doubt that the Monophysites have a full right to regard him as their father and founder. Orthodox writers confess that, in his zeal against one heresy, he sometimes trembled on the verge of its opposite. We, who do not feel called upon to pronounce sentence for or against any of the disputed doctrines, can only regard him as the great embodiment of the Egyptian theological spirit, and consequently of the Egyptian national life.

Monophysitism became the national faith of Egypt, but Nestorianism did not become the national faith of Syria. Nestorianism ultimately took refuge beyond the limits of the Empire, while Monophysitism, in its various forms, became the creed of the whole Roman East, of Syria and Armenia no less than of Egypt and Ethiopia. Nestorianism, persecuted by the Orthodox Emperors of Rome, was received with a certain amount of favour by the Fire-worshipping Kings of Persia. The ecclesiastical policy of these pagan monarchs forestalled that of the Orthodox rulers of Russia and Greece in recent times. No Roman subject was allowed to exercise jurisdiction within the Sassanid Empire. The 'Catholicos' of Chaldaea had hitherto been dependent on the Patriarch of Antioch. He now assumed an independent jurisdiction, and grew into the Nestorian Patriarch of Babylon. And in one duty of a Christian pastor, none of his patriarchal brethren could be compared to him. No sect was ever more distinguished for missionary enterprise than that of Nestorius. Its teachers spread themselves over Persia, India, Tartary, and China, and, in later ages, were held in great honour at the court of many Mogul Khans. The position and sufferings of the modern Nestorians have been made so generally known by the statements of Mr. Layard, that it is needless to enlarge upon them here.

Of the two great Monophysite communions, the most interesting historically is that of Egypt, the most practically important at the present day is that of Armenia. The Monophysite sect soon branched off into an infinite number of smaller schisms, of which we will not profess even to recount the names, much less to explain the differences. Nor is the faith of Egypt and of Armenia identical. Both, indeed, use the fatal expression, 'One Nature;' but Mr. Neale, who has no pity on the Egyptians, is willing to believe that the Armenians err in expression only, and that their faith is substantially orthodox. *We* are most concerned both with Copts and Armenians in

their character of autonomous national Churches, standing protests against any foreign interference, whether from Rome or from Constantinople. Mr. Neale's *History of Alexandria* shows, beyond all doubt, that the Jacobites were the true national Church of Egypt. From Egypt their faith spread over regions independent alike, of the Church and the Empire, in Arabia and Ethiopia. In Arabia its progress was soon checked by the growth of Islam; but the Ethiopic Church still exists,—a spiritual conquest which Monophysite Alexandria may set against the Slavonic victories of Orthodox Byzantium.

The Armenians stand alone among these heretical or national communions in possessing any political importance at the present day. They form a numerous and, from their commercial enterprise, an influential class in both the Russian and the Turkish Empires. This political importance, however, belongs less to the inhabitants of Armenia itself, than to that moneyed Armenian class which is scattered through most eastern cities, even as far as the Coromandel coast of India, and the counting-houses of Madras. Mr. Neale, as we have seen, with all his zeal for orthodoxy, looks on the Armenians as only apparently heterodox, and has hopes of an union between them and the Orthodox Church. We must always rejoice in the prospect of union between Christians of any sort; but an union between Greeks and Armenians would be specially desirable. It is a great hindrance to the native Christian cause in the East, for the two most important native Christian communities to remain in a state of permanent hostility in the sight of their Mussulman rulers. If they could be brought to believe that their difference in faith is merely verbal, and that there is no real impediment to intercommunion, common sense would dictate the retention by each party of its national usages in points of mere discipline and ceremony.

Our second head is the separation between the Orthodox Church and Latin Christendom. We now begin to breathe more freely than in the last division of our subject. We may possibly find but few sympathisers in our vindication of the well-nigh forgotten Copts. But the same principle which leads us to defend the Copts against the Greeks, leads us also to defend the Greeks against the Latins. Here we shall be sure of the approbation not only of our Orthodox friends at home and abroad, but of all those true Englishmen who cannot but rejoice over opposition to the Pope in any quarter of the globe.

The geographical divisions of the Church and the Empire — terms so long mutually convertible — had in truth no small influence on the turn taken by the dispute. The Church was

originally divided into three Patriarchates—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. When Byzantium became an imperial city, a Patriarchate of Constantinople was naturally added, and the Prelate of the New Rome as naturally ranked immediately after the Prelate of the Old. Something of sentimental feeling must have prompted the nearly contemporary erection of a Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Hemmed in between Alexandria and Antioch, it enjoyed a territorial jurisdiction of ludicrously small extent. The foundation of a Patriarchate in Gaul or Spain would have been a far more useful measure. As it was, the whole West was left to the spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. His throne was first in rank, and his jurisdiction was widest in extent. Add to this, that his civil position was totally different from that of his brother at Constantinople. Rome ceased to be an imperial residence as early as the third century. The Pope remained, for many centuries longer, a nominal subject; but his sovereign was commonly a distant one. A Western Emperor or a Gothic King at Ravenna, an Eastern Emperor at Constantinople, a Frank, a Saxon, a Swabian, successively claimed his allegiance; but none of them were permanently on the spot to exact it. Again, as the western limits of the Empire receded, the Patriarch of Rome was necessarily brought into close contact with foreign kings and peoples. Gregory the Great acknowledged himself to be a subject of the Roman Emperor at Constantinople; but he needed no imperial intervention or approval to effect the spiritual conquest of England. The Popes thus gradually acquired the temper and feelings both of temporal and spiritual sovereigns. The grandeur of their position daily increased; and it was easy to improve the primacy which naturally belonged to the Bishop of the Imperial City into a divine authority handed down from the Prince of the Apostles. No such claims could possibly arise in the East. The Bishops of Constantinople had no apostolic pretensions to mystify. Their authority beyond their own immediate diocese indisputably rested upon a mere ecclesiastical arrangement. They had brethren at Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, over whom they enjoyed only a barren precedence. Above all, they were under the direct control of an immediate temporal sovereign reigning in their own city. Under such totally different circumstances, it was impossible for any Eastern Prelate to assume that sort of vague and ilimitable authority which naturally arose in the West. A subject of the Byzantine Emperor might call himself **Œcumenical Patriarch**, and a Rayah of the Egyptian Caliph might deck himself with the still more lordly title of **Œcumenical**

Judge; but it was not in the nature of things that they should ever become real rivals to the Servant of the Servants of God. The Western Church had one undisputed head; the Eastern had four, invested with equal authority, with mere differences of precedence between them. The head of the Western Church was soon released from obedience to any earthly ruler; the heads of the Eastern Church remained, even in their most prosperous days, the subjects of a despotic sovereign, while for a long time past they have been the slaves of an Infidel master.

The real conflict between the Churches has always been this great one of jurisdiction. Rome will tolerate almost every other point, if you will only submit to her on that. There are millions of United Greeks, United Armenians, and the like, who retain all their national usages on this one condition. The Syrian Maronites are said to be the strongest Ultramontanians in the world; yet they retain their native rites and discipline unchanged. Rome is of course best pleased if you will accept every jot and tittle of her system; but, if driven to it, she will tolerate a married clergy, vernacular services, communion in both kinds, even the omission of the '*Filioque*' in the Creed. But submission to the infallible guide can never be dispensed with. Here, in fact, lies the broad distinction between Greek Orthodoxy and Latin Catholicity. The irreconcilable difference between Rome and Constantinople, just as between Rome and England, is the question of the Papal Supremacy. By the time that the controversy had reached its full height, the Orthodox Church had become almost wholly Greek, and the Roman Pontiffs had long cast off even a nominal allegiance to the Byzantine Cæsars. The pretensions of the West were now utterly alien to Greek national feeling. Orthodox 'Romans' could as little recognise the barbarian Pontiff as the barbarian Emperor. And the great Emperors of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries had no occasion to humble themselves like the miserable Palæologi of the fourteenth and fifteenth. With them the question was doubtless mainly a political one. Meanwhile, the theological mind had food afforded it by the *Filioque* dispute. And the mass of the people on both sides, incapable of entering into either the political or the theological question, adopted, as Mr. Finlay says, 'the simple rule, to hate the members of the 'other church.' To them the question of 'Azyms' was the most important of all. Men who knew little of the policy of Popes and Cæsars were scandalised at the use of leavened or of unleavened bread. The presence or absence of yeast was deemed as essential to salvation as it now is in other lands that the preacher should be clothed in a black or in a white garment.



The magnitude of the Papal controversy naturally grew with the growth of the Papal pretensions. During the eighth and ninth centuries, in the Iconoclast and Photian controversies, we find the Popes protesting against particular emperors, patriarchs, and synods, but not venturing on any universal anathema. In fact, one main point of dispute during this period shows that the Papal claims were far from having reached their highest point. Up to the eighth century, the Western Patriarchate extended on both sides of the Adriatic. Illyricum, Dacia, Macedonia, and Greece, belonged to the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. During the earliest arrangements of the Church this was quite intelligible. Rome was a more natural centre for those countries than Alexandria or Antioch. But it is strange that such an arrangement should have survived the establishment of a Patriarchal see at Constantinople. The vigorous mind of Leo the Isaurian perceived the anomaly. He doubtless saw that Italy was slipping from his grasp, and that its retention was no real source of power. He therefore could not tolerate the possession of jurisdiction within his immediate Empire by a prelate who would soon cease to be his vassal. He removed the districts in question from the Patriarchate of Rome to that of Constantinople, and he confiscated divers estates belonging to the Roman See. The restoration of this property and jurisdiction was continually demanded up to the time of the final schism. This demand for a limited jurisdiction proves that the Popes did not as yet assert an unlimited one; at all events, that they did not venture to press such claims in the East, where their pretensions could be weighed and sifted. After the establishment of the Empire of Charlemagne, when the Popes had ceased to be even nominal subjects of the Byzantine throne, their claims to an eastern jurisdiction were still less likely to be attended to. And the East might well rejoice in being free from all connexion with the turbulent and profligate Pontiffs of the tenth century. The interference of the Saxon Emperors, like the more permanent reforms of their Franconian successors, rendered the Papacy more respectable; but, at the same time, they displayed it more distinctly as a foreign power. Basil the Second, one of the greatest rulers that the East ever beheld, proposed a very reasonable concordat. The Eastern Church was to recognise the honorary primacy of the Western Patriarch; but the Western Patriarch was to recognise the internal independence of the Eastern Church. An indemnity in money was to be accepted by the Pope for the loss of property and jurisdiction within the Eastern Empire. These terms were rejected; but the schism cannot be looked upon as finally

consummated before the anathema left upon the altar of St. Sophia by the Papal legates in 1053.

Even in later times, even down to our own day, the Roman Church has hardly ventured to treat the Orthodox as a mere heretical sect, but rather as a fallen Church. It was only very gradually that mutual hatred reached its full height. The Norman conquerors of Sicily at first recognised, and always tolerated, the Greek prelates whom they found there under the Saracen yoke. The Crusades were undertaken to assist the Byzantine Empire as well as to recover Jerusalem. On the capture of Antioch, one of the first proceedings of the Crusaders was to restore the Greek Patriarch to his throne. But this state of feeling soon altered. Religious and national differences were too strong for Greeks and Latins to act in permanent harmony. The restored Patriarch of Antioch soon found it expedient to retire to Constantinople; and under the Latin masters of Syria, the native Christians, whether Melchite or Jacobite, were hardly better off than under Turks or Saracens. At last came the enormous wrong of 1204, one hardly smaller than that of 1453. A gang of western banditti, under the guise of Crusaders, sacked the capital of the East, partitioned the empire, and held a large portion of the Greek race in permanent bondage. The Greek Church and nation have never forgotten the fourth Crusade.

From that day to this the enmity between the two churches has been of the bitterest character. The attempt to reconcile them seems hopeless. On many points, both of doctrine and ceremony, it only requires a conciliatory spirit on both sides to effect, if not a reconciliation, at least a compromise. But the great difficulty of the supremacy always interposes itself. The successor of St. Peter, the vicegerent of Christ, the personal centre of unity to the whole Church, cannot sink into the mere elder brother of Constantinople and Moscow. And every national, religious, and traditional feeling unites in prompting the Orthodox to resist the papal claims to the uttermost. Ecclesiastically, they are supporting the ancient constitution of the universal Church against the novel usurpations of Rome. Politically, they are defending the right of each nation to order its own ecclesiastical affairs without the interference of any alien power. Since the papal claims reached their fulness, a reconciliation on equal terms has been impossible. The proposal of Basil the Bulgarian-Slayer was the last hope. In his day the Western Pontiff had not yet assumed the claims of Hildebrand and Innocent. Moreover, the Eastern Emperor was still the mightiest sovereign of Christendom, to whom the old Rome still looked, in more than one moment of despair, for deliverance

alike from her Saracen invader and her Teutonic master. When in after times his successors sought for reconciliation with the Roman See, things had indeed strangely altered. The Palæologi were perpetually asking for union. But they came in the character not of negociators but of mendicants. They sought for union with the Western Church, because they needed the arms of western warriors to defend them against the invincible barbarians. Union now meant only submission. Great outward courtesy might be observed; the imperial guest might be received with every imperial honour; fraternal embraces might be exchanged between the eastern and the western Pontiffs; but nothing disguised the plain fact that emperor and patriarch came to beg for political alms as the price of acknowledging themselves as returning schismatics. The repeated 'unions,' from the first to the last Palæologus, did nothing but paralyse the already tottering throne of Constantinople. Emperors and patriarchs might go through an edifying ceremony; but neither policy nor persecution could ever obtain the assent of the Greek clergy and people. A far more effectual foreign help than was ever obtained would have failed to counterbalance the violence done to all national feeling. And now, we must remember, the Byzantine territories were no longer coextensive with the Greek nation. If the Emperor of Constantinople betrayed the cause of his church and country, the Emperor of Trebizond and the Despot of Epirus deemed it all the more incumbent on them to assert the rights of Oriental orthodoxy. Even in those Greek countries which were subject to Latin rulers, the Union made only individual proselytes, and never became the national faith. This state of things continued till the final fall of the empire. Nothing can add to the heroic fame of the last Constantine; nothing can lessen the infamy of the fanatics who allowed sectarian differences to weaken the hands of the patriot and the martyr. Yet it does jar upon one's feelings to remember that the last Christian Emperor of the new Rome had stooped to acknowledge himself the spiritual vassal of the old, and that the last Christian sacrifice within the walls of St. Sophia was celebrated with strange and foreign rites, from which the national instinct shrunk as from an abomination.

The Eastern, Greek, or Orthodox Church was thus gradually developed as a distinct Christian community, by separation from the Oriental sects on the one hand and from Latin Christendom on the other. It became the national faith of the Byzantine

Empire and of the Greek nation. We have now to see it extend itself beyond their limits.

The Eastern Churches have often been reproached as not being Missionary Churches. Both Catholics and Protestants, we are told, labour to spread the Gospel in heathen lands, while the Oriental sects sit still and do nothing. We have already seen that this reproach does not apply either to the Jacobite or to the Nestorian Communion. Nor can it be attributed with any fairness to their Orthodox opponents. As regards the Orthodox Church in Turkey for some centuries past, it is hard to say what it could be expected to do in the way of missionary enterprise. A church whose existence at home was a continued martyrdom was not likely to send forth apostles to evangelise Africa or China. But wherever the Orthodox Church has had full scope for her energies, the charge of supineness in the missionary work has not been deserved. Neither the old Byzantine nor the modern Russian Church can be accused of indolence in this respect. The conversion of Russia itself was as mighty a spiritual conquest as any church ever won, and from old Russia the faith has gradually spread over the vast regions which form the present Russian Empire. And we are now led to that characteristic of the Orthodox Church which reflects the highest honour upon her in her missionary capacity. She has everywhere become national. She has everywhere translated her ritual into the language of the people. Speaking the language of Chrysostom and Clement, and of the New Testament itself, she would have had more excuse than the Latin Church for forcing a foreign tongue upon her barbarian converts. But from her first proselytes to our own time, Greeks, Russians, Bulgarians, Wallachs, and Georgians have worshipped in their several tongues according to the same ritual. In some parts of Asia Minor there are Christian congregations which know no language but Turkish. These have the Liturgy of the Orthodox Church translated into the speech of the Infidel. In some countries doubtless the ecclesiastical language has ceased to be intelligible. The ritual of the Church of Russia is still celebrated in the old Slavonic language of Cyril and Methodius. Old Greek and old Slavonic have, in many districts, become practically unknown tongues. An Anglo-Saxon mass would have been no more intelligible to an Englishman of the sixteenth century than a Latin one; but the abuse would have at once suggested its own remedy. That the Liturgy is in Russian or English at all, proves of itself that it ought to be in intelligible Russian and intelligible English. It was in the conversion of our own island that the Latin Church was tried and found

wanting in this most important duty. When, by the conversion of England, the Latin Church first embraced a people wholly alien to the Roman Empire, she was as much bound to provide them with a Liturgy in their own tongue as we are now to provide our Welsh fellow-countrymen with a Welsh version of the Prayer-book. Greek was the ecclesiastical language of the East, Latin of the West; the same principle which dictated their use dictated also that of Teutonic in the North. The contrary policy was adopted. Rome forced Latin upon the Teutons, while Constantinople did not force Greek upon the Slaves. Each has had her appropriate reward. Rome built up a vast spiritual monarchy, a centralised despotism ruling over subject kingdoms. Constantinople was content with being the constitutional president of a willing federation. The Western Church has therefore always remained distinctively Latin, while the Eastern has always been the real national Church, identified with the national life of every people which has accepted her teaching.

The Orthodox Church, originally the Church of the Greek race, gradually became the Church of all those nations which derived their Christianity and civilisation from Byzantine sources. This definition, as far as Europe is concerned, answers almost exactly to the Eastern branch of the Slavonic family. The Western Slaves, those of Poland and Bohemia, the Wends of Germany, and the Slovaks of Hungary, were admitted into the Christian and civilised pale through the medium of the Latin Church and the Latin Empire. The Greek Church and the Greek Empire did the like by the Serbs, Bulgarians, and Russians. To these we may add a portion of the Albanians; and that remarkable race, so remote from the Slaves in language, so closely connected with them in political and religious history—the Roumans or Wallachs. But the Eastern Slaves were the great conquest of Byzantine religion and civilisation; they are to the East what the Teutons are to the West; Albanians and Roumans may pass as a sort of appendage, balancing the Latinism of the Western Slaves. To this day, the ethnological division between the two branches of the Slavonic race coincides as nearly as possible with that between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Even when Polish or Austrian intolerance has brought Serbs or Russians under Papal bondage, it has almost always been in the intermediate form of ‘United Greeks.’ In like manner, though the Moravians and some other portions of the Western Slaves first heard of Christianity from Byzantine missionaries, yet they all ultimately conformed to the Latin Communion.

The Slaves first came into connexion with the Empire in the

seventh century, when Heraclius invited colonists of that race to occupy the northern part of Illyricum. Soon after began that settlement of the Bulgarians on the Lower Danube, which, for three centuries, supplied the Byzantine Empire with its most formidable foes. Whatever their original descent, the Bulgarians of history must be regarded as essentially Slavonic. By the close of the ninth century, this whole Slavonic population, whether subject, tributary, or hostile to the Empire, had received Christianity in its Byzantine form.

But a greater spiritual conquest even than Servia and Bulgaria was in store for the Byzantine Church. It was from her that the countless millions of the Russian race were to receive their Christian enlightenment. Nowhere is the thoroughly national character of the Orthodox Church more strikingly shown than in the whole history of that empire. Vladimir the Great adopted Orthodox Christianity deliberately and after examination. Jewish, Mahometan, and Catholic missionaries had all essayed his conversion. He listened to all, and made his election in favour of the faith of Byzantium. Events proved that he judged wisely. The Orthodox Church, in Russia as elsewhere, identified itself with the nation in a way that could hardly have been done by a communion dependent upon a foreign Pope or Caliph. The relations between Russia and Constantinople supply a pleasing instance of the growth of a religious colony, and illustrate the really flexible constitution of the changeless Eastern Church. So long as youth and feebleness required it, the colony retained its dependence on the metropolis. When it had grown to maturity, it attained independence with the perfect good-will of the mother Church, and constantly retained the most friendly relations towards its ancient parent. As soon as any regular order could be established in the newly-formed church, we find Russia, by the middle of the eleventh century, constituted as a distinct Metropolitanate under the Patriarch of Constantinople. The early Metropolitanans were naturally Greeks. As the new church took root and strengthened, its highest dignity began to be conferred upon native Russians. In the shiftings and divisions of the sovereign authority among the descendants of Ruric, the chief seat of ecclesiastical power constantly changed its position in company with the chief seat of temporal power. The Metropolitan See was successively translated from Kief to Vladimir and from Vladimir to Moscow. The Russian Church, using the native language, governed by native prelates, fostered by native princes, worked itself into the national life of the people. The Orthodox faith has twice preserved the national existence of Russia under

Mahometan and under Catholic domination. It is easy to mock at the watchword of 'Holy Russia;' but the phrase shows how deeply the religious and the national feeling are blended together. All that we need regret is, that so noble a feeling as that which the Russian people bear towards their Church and country should ever have been perverted by state-craft into an engine of aggression against men of other creeds and races.

In the thirteenth century Asia and Eastern Europe were overrun by the Moguls. They penetrated as far west as Silesia; but Russia was the only European country of which they retained any permanent hold. To understand the position of Russia and the Russian Church at this time, we must remember, that the extent of the Russian Empire was then much more nearly identical with its present European dimensions, than with the narrower heritage of Peter the Great. The first appearance of Russians on the Euxine dates not from the eighteenth, but from the ninth century. The future site of Sebastopol became Russian ground in the days of the first Christian Czar. Again, much of what Russia conquered in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from Lithuania and Poland, was really old Russian territory, Russian in race, language, and religion. The diminution of Russian territory, as distinguished from its division among native rulers, dates from the invasion of the Moguls. The three Khanates into which their vast dominion split, those of Kasan, Astrakhan, and the Crimea, nearly hemmed in the small domains which the native princes retained as tributaries to their Mahometan masters. Lithuania and Poland meanwhile pressed on from the West, and Kief itself, the ancient capital, passed to the dominion of a foreign ruler. Thus, between Mahometan and Catholic domination, the Orthodox Church of Russia was deeply humbled, often actually persecuted. The efforts of the Catholic Kings of Poland, especially in the seventeenth century, to convert their Orthodox Russian subjects to the Latin faith form a melancholy chapter in the history of religious intolerance. They obtained a modified success by bringing over large bodies to the condition of 'United Greeks.' Since their re-incorporation with Russia, most of them have returned to full communion with the Orthodox Church. It is whispered, and we can readily believe it, that this result, so desirable in itself, has not been obtained without unjustifiable means on the part of the Russian Government. But in common fairness we ought not to forget that, if Orthodox Russia now tyrannises over Catholic Poland, there was a time when Catholic Poland tyrannised over Orthodox Russia.

The turning-point in Russian history is the reign of John

the Terrible in the sixteenth century. His life and character, his awful crimes and his momentary compunctions, the wild and inconstant nature of his whole career, form one of the strangest pictures in the history of mankind. It is quite in character with the spirit of his race that a strong religious element should be mingled with his cruelty or madness. Yet Russia owes much to him. Under him she finally arose from her political degradation; he paved the way for her future career by establishing her own independence and breaking the power of her old masters. He conquered Kusan and Astrakhan, but somewhat strangely left the third Khanate, that of the Crimea, untouched. If we may believe Mr. Palmer, John the Terrible brought upon himself the curse of Saul by forbearing to smite its Amalekite possessors. This view is too deep for us; we are rather struck by the parallel between the Tartars of Southern Russia and the Moors of Southern Spain, and are led to marvel in both cases at the sudden stoppage in the career of Christian victory.

The Orthodox faith had guided Russia through the fiery trial of Mahometan subjection. In the seventeenth century came another season of temptation. Moscow, like Constantinople, had to undergo a temporary Latin occupation. Not only had a large portion of Russia been long subject to the Polish sceptre; a Polish prince now for a brief moment actually occupied the Kremlin. Never did Russia so conspicuously owe her deliverance to her national Church. It was from the Lavras of her monks, not from the castles of her Boyards, that the call to independence arose, and the first Czar of the new national dynasty was the son of the reigning Patriarch.

We have forestalled the great ecclesiastical change in the history of Russia. In 1587 the Russian Church was established as a distinct Patriarchate, independent of the throne of Constantinople. The Orthodox Church now recognised five equal Pontiffs, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Moscow. The reasons for the change were obvious. Constantinople had once been, in every sense, the head of Eastern Christendom. Russia owed her no political allegiance, but she looked up to her with the reverence of a child or a scholar. But now everything was changed. Russia had advanced and Constantinople had gone back. The lords of the imperial city were now infidel enemies, doubly hateful from their alliance with the remnant of Russia's old oppressors. St. Sophia, the glory of all Eastern Christendom, had become the abode of a false worship. The Œcumenical Patriarch was appointed and deposed at the bidding of an unbelieving master. Meanwhile the Czar had assumed



something like the ecclesiastical place of the Byzantine Emperors. He was the first of Orthodox Princes, ruling over by far the largest branch of the Holy Eastern Church. It was utterly impossible that the Russian Church could any longer remain subject to a distant and enslaved spiritual head. But that such a change could be effected without schism, controversy, or disturbance of any kind, is a most striking commentary on the character of the Eastern Church. The regard to national distinctions, the capability of adaptation to political changes, which so honourably distinguish the Orthodox Communion, were never more conspicuous than in this most remarkable case.

The Russian Patriarchate did not last long. Some of the Patriarchs were great men. The career of Nikon, especially, in the seventeenth century, is one on which we would gladly enlarge. The last Patriarch, Adrian, died in 1700. He had been an opponent of the changes introduced by Peter the Great; and this probably led the reforming Czar to the suppression of the Patriarchate. His successor, Stephen, bore no higher title than Guardian of the Patriarchal See, and, in 1723, by an agreement between the Czar and the other Eastern Churches, the personal Patriarchate of Moscow was formally abolished. The patriarchal power was entrusted to a commission of Bishops, who bear the title of the Most Holy Governing Synod. The Orthodox Church thus became, in appearance, a confederation of four monarchies and an aristocracy. But the result of the change from patriarchal to synodical government has been to render the Russian Church more dependent on a monarchy, which, under the system introduced by Peter, could hardly fail to lose something of its old religious character. The Synod inherits the powers of the Patriarch, but the Synod is a far less formidable institution than the Patriarchate. An individual head, though chosen by the Sovereign, may always turn out a Becket or a Nikon. But a board can always be quietly and decorously managed. With a governing Synod, things will go on very smoothly; a Pope or a Patriarch may at any time conceal the latent elements of a Guelf and Ghibelin war.\*

---

\* The history of the Russian Church, even apart from the special point of view in which we have regarded it, is a highly interesting piece of ecclesiastical history. M. Mouravieff's book contains a mass of information not otherwise easily accessible to the English reader; it is, moreover, a curiosity in itself. M. Mouravieff is a layman and a courtier, having been Chamberlain to the late Emperor; but his book is written with all the simplicity and good faith of a mediæval chronicler. It is clearly not with him, as it seems to be with some of our

This danger, however, does not seem ever to have disturbed the relations of Church and State under the Byzantine Empire. The close identification of the Church and the nation involved a high degree of what is called Erastianism. Throughout the West, there was a conflict of jurisdictions; either the spiritual or the temporal power was everywhere more or less external. But a single society cannot have two co-ordinate independent heads. When a Church and a nation are identical, either the Pope will become Cæsar, or the Cæsar will become Pope. And the two opposite processes come to nearly the same practical result; the temporal power commonly triumphs in the long run. The Caliphate was a case of a Pontiff incidentally invested with temporal power; but, even among the Bagdad Caliphs, much more among the Ottoman Sultans, the temporal character has quite overshadowed the spiritual. The Roman Pontiff indeed still remains primarily a Pope, and only incidentally a Prince. But did all who recognise him as Pope obey him as Prince, his spiritual character would soon be as completely obscured as that of a German Archiepiscopal Elector.

The Byzantine Empire exhibits the contrary process. The Church and the nation being identical, the head of the nation naturally became the head of the Church. The will of Cæsar was as omnipotent in the Synod as in the Senate. But then Cæsar was not, as in the West, an external power. He devoted as much of his attention to ecclesiastical as to secular matters, and appeared equally at home in both capacities. Almost every Byzantine Emperor figures as a theologian or a canonist. And it was only when the unfortunate Palæologi deserted their posts as leaders of the nation, that any objection was made to temporal rulers acting as leaders of the Church. National and religious feeling arose against princes, who threw themselves at the feet of the Western Antichrist. But it was not so in earlier times. The greatest statesmen and the most valiant warriors, we must add the bloodiest tyrants and the most shameless profligates, were all busily employed in ecclesiastical matters as one of their most natural functions. Theodora herself was regarded by some as a saint, and by others as a heretic; and Andronicus Comnenus devoted to theological lore, whatever time he could spare from his amours, his brigandage, and his treasons. But we may be quite sure that that was no contemptible

---

own ecclesiastical writers, an artificial frame of mind. His faith and zeal are evidently not merely sincere, but perfectly native. In such a country as Russia is described as being, this strikes us as a remarkable phenomenon.

or unworthy pursuit which guided the policy of the Isaurian and the Armenian Léo, of Constantine Copronymus and the Amorian Theophilus, which could attract the intellect of the first Basil amidst the work of legislation, and arrest the attention of the second amidst his splendid career of victory. In short, the creed and the language had formed the nation; Orthodoxy was the distinction and the bulwark of the 'Roman' people; and the 'Faithful Emperor of the Romans' became as naturally and appropriately the chief ruler of the Byzantine Church as of the Byzantine Empire.

We ought now, in chronological strictness, to describe the working of the Orthodox Church while its natural head, the Roman Cæsar, was exchanged for a foreign master in the Ottoman Sultan. But we have little to add to what we have already said on that subject in a former article. We may, however, mention that Mr. Finlay's last volume, '*Greece under Othoman and Venetian Domination*,' published since that article appeared, fully bears out the statements which we there made. The identification of the church and the nation under the Byzantine Empire led to important results after the Turkish conquest. The politic scheme of Mahomet the Conqueror was to govern the Greeks through the Greeks themselves. Their ecclesiastical organisation supplied a ready means of so doing. The Orthodox Church, in the Ottoman dominions, stood in the strange position of being at once established and persecuted. Its membership at once conferred posts of honour and excluded from them. While no Christian could rise above the pettiest civil offices—the Phanariot aristocracy had not yet arisen—the head of the Christian community enjoyed the state of one of the great dignitaries of the empire. The individual Christian was condemned to a degraded position, but the Christian Church was a recognised institution of the empire, with its rights, powers, and possessions as securely guaranteed as anything can be guaranteed under an Eastern despotism. We are here speaking of the system established by Mahomet the Second, not of its practical working under his successors. Mahomet shrank from no crime which would serve his purposes; but he was a profound statesman, and very far from a fanatic. It quite fell in with his policy to give the Christians as much toleration as he could. At heart he was probably equally indifferent to both creeds, and we may well believe that only unavoidable necessity hindered him from establishing perfect equality between them. But when his sceptre passed on to bigots, faineants, and vulgar tyrants, every article of his charter was violated. Yet his policy was far from remaining without fruit.

He succeeded in permanently converting the highest dignitaries of the Orthodox Church into instruments of Ottoman rule. Among the list of patriarchs and other high prelates, there have been many men of real virtue, learning, and sanctity ; but though they were the recognised chiefs of the nation, they have seldom indeed appeared as patriotic leaders. Not so the rural Papades and Kaloyers ; not so even the bishops of the smaller and obscurer sees. From 1453 to 1821, priests and monks have been the soul of every patriotic movement. But, from Gennadius to Gregory, the patriarchs have been, at best, the submissive victims, too often the active instruments, of Ottoman tyranny. Exactly similar was the difference between the Princes of the Phanar, striving to supplant one another on tributary thrones, and the brave and patriotic people whose name they exposed to undeserved contempt. The difference is four hundred years old ; in the fifteenth, as in the nineteenth century, the peasants of Peloponnesus died sword in hand upon their mountains ; the Byzantine aristocracy shrank from a glorious martyrdom by the side of their Emperor to meet with an ignominious massacre at the hands of his infidel conqueror.

The separation of the Greek Kingdom from the Ottoman Empire has led to ecclesiastical consequences somewhat similar to those which attended the growth of Russia and the fall of Constantinople. The war of independence put a necessary stop to all intercourse between the insurgent Greeks and their spiritual head. Moreover, Gregory himself, the victim of Mahmud, had, at the Sultan's bidding, condemned the insurrection, and anathematised the insurgents. During the war, Greece remained in as chaotic a state in ecclesiastical as in temporal matters. But, on the establishment of the kingdom, the Greek people naturally looked for the establishment of some settled order in the Church also. The first step was a bold, but a necessary one. The Church of Greece must be declared no less independent than the Kingdom of Greece. Many laudable feelings must indeed have been shocked by the severance of so ancient and sacred a tie as that which bound Hellas to the Œcumenical throne of Constantinople. But no independent State ought to recognise an ecclesiastical superior in a subject of a foreign potentate. Above all, liberated Greece could not recognise an ecclesiastical superior in a Rayah of the Turkish Sultan. In still more recent times serious complications have arisen from prelates, subjects of Austria, exercising jurisdiction over some small portions of the Swiss Cantons. Still less could Greece continue to pledge her highest spiritual allegiance to a pontiff who held his rank at the sufferance of her enemy, who was

liable to be changed at every fluctuation in the caprice or policy of an infidel court. Greece had now as good reason to disown the supremacy of Constantinople as she had in earlier ages to accept it. A sound political cause established the Byzantine Patriarchate in the fourth century. A sound political cause placed Hellas under its dominion in the eighth. A third political cause, no less sound than either, required in the nineteenth that the Church of liberated Greece, while preserving all Christian fellowship and doctrinal unity with other branches of the Orthodox Church, should recognise no ecclesiastical jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Greek Kingdom. It was but following the Russian precedent of the sixteenth century on still stronger grounds. It was universally felt that the limits of the Hellenic Kingdom and the Hellenic Church ought to coincide. If those limits excluded some millions of Greeks in creed, race, and language, that was certainly not the fault either of the liberated kingdom or of the liberated Church.

The act of the Synod of Nauplia which, in 1833, declared the independence of the Hellenic Church, was undoubtedly an act of sound and patriotic policy. The chief promoter of this step was the historian Trikoupi, then Minister of Public Worship, and now the respected representative of Greece in this country, who, by thus securing the ecclesiastical independence of his country, added largely to his other claims on the national gratitude. As to the particular constitution of the liberated Church, there might be more controversy than as to the general question of its liberation. The ancient traditions of the Orthodox Church would have pointed to the establishment of Athens as a sixth patriarchal throne. But, since Czar Peter, there had been no longer a fifth; and the system which had supplanted the Patriarchate of Moscow was far more likely to commend itself to the ideas of modern statesmen. Greece then, like Russia, has a Holy Synod as her highest ecclesiastical authority; and the Hellenic Church, while recognising Christ alone as her spiritual head, does not scruple to recognise the King of Greece as her chief governor in external matters.

But the ecclesiastical independence of Greece was not so tranquilly acquiesced in by the Œcumenical throne as the ecclesiastical independence of Russia. Nor are we surprised at this. The Greek movement had more of the external look of an act of schism, and it was mixed up with political questions which could hardly have applied to the Muscovy of the sixteenth century. A Patriarch of Constantinople, jealous of the ancient rights of his see, might honestly look upon the liberated Hellenes as schismatics deserving ecclesiastical censure. Still less would

his Turkish master fail to seize upon so excellent a pretext for sowing dissension between the two great divisions of the Greek race. What could so well serve his purpose as for the head of the Orthodox Church to represent the liberated Hellenes as straying from the paths of Orthodox obedience, while the Rayahs of Turkey still continued to walk in the way wherein they should go? From whatever cause, the Byzantine Patriarchs refused to recognise the Holy Synod of the Greek kingdom, and treated the liberated Greeks, though strictly adhering to the Orthodox creed and ritual, as at least disturbers of the unity of the Church.

In 1850 an union was effected, but in a form which deeply wounded the feelings of many patriotic Greeks. The then Greek Ministry, in pursuance of a vote of the Holy Synod, made a solemn request to the Patriarch Anthimos for an official recognition of the Holy Synod of Greece. The request was natural and laudable: a certain honorary deference to the Œcumenical throne was natural and laudable also. But the Greek Government should have conducted the negotiation in the style of a Power seeking to terminate a misunderstanding with another Power, and the reconciliation should have taken the form of a treaty of peace between two equal contracting parties. But, as it was, the public feeling of Greece detected something far too submissive in the tone of the Greek Ministry, something far too authoritative in the tone of the Byzantine Patriarch. The celebrated *Τόμος συνοδικός*, issued by the Patriarch Anthimos\*, breathes too much of the spirit of his Western rival or of his Eastern master. He does not negotiate, but dictates; instead of accepting a treaty on equal terms, he grants favours on certain conditions. The words may be those of an Apostle, but the tone is too much that of Hildebrand or Innocent, when, in one of the documents accompanying the *Τόμος*, the Byzantine Prelate speaks of himself as having received from God the care of all the churches.† We are not surprised that such a document grievously wounded Greek national feeling. The spirited, though needlessly violent, volume *περὶ Ἀληθείας*, attributed to M. Pharmakides, is understood to have been the chief cause of the somewhat lax execution of the

---

\* It is characteristic of the state of things under Ottoman rule that the *Τόμος*, besides the reigning Patriarch, is signed by *five* of his predecessors.

† *Ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐλέω Θεοῦ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν μέριμναν πασῶν τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτὰς οἰκονομίας ἄνωθεν ἐμπειστέυμενοι τὴν διαχείρισιν.*

*Τόμος*. The ecclesiastical independence of Greece was not seriously compromised. The recognition of the Holy Synod by the Church of Constantinople was followed by its recognition by the other branches of the Orthodox Church. Some of the conditions\* on which the recognition was granted were embodied in a law passed in 1852. But neither that law, nor any other on the Greek statute-book, recognises or mentions the *Τόμος* in any way.

The Church of the Greek Kingdom is at present in a position more interesting to western observers than any of its fellows. The Orthodox Church is there more distinctly on its trial than in Russia or Turkey. It is there that this ancient, changeless communion must show how it can adapt itself to the requirements of modern politics and society, to the workings of a popular constitution, to the intellectual needs of a busy and inquiring people, to constant intercourse on equal terms with the professors of other creeds. It will require skill, patience, and exertion to guide it through such a struggle, but there is no reason to despair. The Orthodox Church has many practical faults; ages of slavery have introduced much ignorance and corruption, which a few years of liberty cannot throw off at once. But there is no vice at the root, corrupting the system, like the Roman doctrine of Supremacy. There is nothing in the constitution of the Orthodox Church to hinder any amount of internal improvement, wherever its rites and discipline may not be adapted to the exigencies of modern times. The great evils under the Ottoman domination were the ignorance and the simony of the clergy. The latter vice had eaten like a canker into the vitals of the Orthodox Church; but the fault lay at least as much with its Ottoman masters as with the Church itself. The highest dignities could only be obtained at the hands of the Sultan, and his nomination could only be had for money. The Turks plundered the bishops; the bishops were driven to prey upon the papades, and the papades, in their turn, to prey upon their flocks. We believe that this miserable state of things has quite ceased in independent Greece, and that even in Turkey it is less outrageous than it was. As to the other vice of ignorance, whatever may be the faults of the Greek people, no one can accuse them of lack of zeal in the cause of education. Clerical education has come in for its share, and

---

\* One change required by the *Τόμος*, and inserted in the Law of 1852, is a decided improvement. The metropolitan of Attica is now official President of the Synod, instead of an annual President appointed by the Crown.

bills for its farther promotion appear among the most recent measures laid before the Greek Chambers. The Athenian press, so fertile in periodical literature, produces at least one theological journal\*, conducted by men of station in the Eastern Church, and which is not, like analogous publications among ourselves, driven to be the organ of a mere party within the national communion. Evils of so many centuries' standing cannot be reformed in a day; but we believe that there is a good will to reform them, and there is certainly nothing in the essential principles of the Orthodox Church likely to throw any obstacles in the way of their reformation.

We will conclude with a brief view of the relations between the Eastern Church and the Reformed Churches of the West. A movement towards an union between them commenced at an early stage of the Reformation. There was much which the two held in common. The one had recently thrown off, the other had always successfully resisted, the anti-national domination of Rome. Many of the grossest practical abuses of the Latin Church were as alien to Eastern tradition as to Western Reform. On many of the abstract points of controversy the Eastern Church had never formally decided, and therefore was at least not committed to the Roman view. Above all, an union with the ancient, unchangeable seats of Oriental orthodoxy would have been the most practical of all answers to the prestige possessed by Roman antiquity over Protestant novelty. Negotiations with the East commenced as early as the time of Melancthon, who submitted the Confession of Augsburg to the then Patriarch Joasaph. At a later period the Tübingen divines asked for the opinion of the Patriarch Jeremiah on a full exposition of the Protestant doctrines. His reply was unfavourable; but no formal judgment upon Protestantism was as yet pronounced by the Eastern Church. That step, if it is to be regarded as having been taken at all, was only brought about by a remarkable series of events in the seventeenth century.

The most famous name in the history of the Greek Church since the Ottoman Conquest, is certainly that of Cyril Lucar, successively Patriarch of Alexandria and of Constantinople. Mr. Neale has given a full narrative of his career in his history of the former see. He has had the advantage of access to some unpublished letters of Cyril's, and his narrative is one of the best portions of his book. It exhibits his usual fairness in state-

---

\* The *Εὐαγγελικὸς Κήρυξ*, published monthly at Athens, under the editorship of two theological professors in the University.



ments of fact, while the nature of the comments required by Mr. Neale's peculiar ecclesiastical position is even more amusing than usual. Another account of Cyril, written of course from a strictly Greek and Orthodox point of view, appeared in livraisons in the '*Spectateur de l'Orient*,' during 1855. We are ourselves more inclined to favour Cyril than either the Greek or the English writer. But both of them, while censuring his conduct both on religious and political grounds, agree in their testimony to his personal sanctity and single-mindedness.

The history of Cyril exhibits the Greek Church and nation at its lowest point of humiliation. In the first half of the seventeenth century Ottoman tyranny had reached its height. The days of comparative good government under the great Sultans had ceased; the days of comparative alleviation had not yet begun. The tribute of children was still levied, but Cyril himself lost his chance of becoming a Pasha or a Grand Vizier, by being born a subject of Venice. He was a Cretan; like so many other Venetian Greeks, he studied at the University of Padua, but he did not, like some of his brethren, become entangled by the allurements and sophistries of Rome. He seems rather to have taken the vow of an ecclesiastical Hannibal. We first hear of him, in the last days of the sixteenth century, as sent on a mission from the Alexandrine Church to stop the torrent of Roman proselytism in Polish Russia. In Poland he saw both Orthodox and Protestants persecuted alike by Catholic bigotry, and it was there probably that he was first led to wish that both might make common cause against the common enemy. His later intercourse with various Dutch and Genevan teachers, and with our own Archbishop Abbot, led him into an identification with the Calvinistic theology, and into expressions of fraternity with Presbyterian ministers, which are grievous offences in the eyes of Mr. Neale. To his own brethren he seems to have given no offence during his lifetime. His '*Confession of Faith*' was probably far better known in the West than in the East. Through his whole career he was certainly regarded as the champion of the Greek Church and nation against an organised Papal aggression.

There is so much to interest in the personal history of Cyril Lucar, and it affords so good an illustration of the condition of the Greek Church under Ottoman domination, that we deeply regret our inability to record his struggle with his Jesuit opponents at any considerable detail. Six times in his life was Cyril installed in a Patriarchal See. In 1602 he was raised to the throne of Alexandria; in 1621 he was translated to the highest place in the Eastern Church. In 1638 he suffered martyrdom,

by at least indirect Jesuit instigation, by the command of the ferocious Sultan Amurath IV. In the course of the intervening seventeen years he was four times deposed, and as many times restored to the Œcumenical throne. Each election of Cyril was a triumph for England and Holland; each deposition was a triumph for France and Rome. Throughout the dispute, no calumny was too wild for the Jesuits to allege if it could only induce the Sultan to command the deposition of Cyril Lucar. Their creature, Cyril of Bercea, was more than once intruded into the Patriarchal throne during his lifetime, and finally succeeded to his place on his martyrdom. He did not long occupy his ill-gotten dignity, as in 1639 Sultan Amurath commanded his banishment and death. But he had time in the interval to call together a Synod at Constantinople, which violently anathematised Cyril Lucar and his doctrines. Succeeding councils contented themselves with condemning Protestant doctrines without hurling violent invectives at a champion and martyr of the Greek nation. The Synod of Jassy, in 1641, dealt gently with his memory. That of Bethlehem\* or Jerusalem, in 1672, pronounced his Confession a forgery, and only blamed him for not explicitly repudiating it.

The creed promulgated by this council, the latest authorised Confession of the Eastern Church, is analysed and commented upon at some length by Mr. Neale. To our non-theological eyes it certainly seems to inculcate Transubstantiation and Purgatory; but we shall be much better pleased to believe, with Mr. Neale, that it does not really commit the Orthodox Church to those dogmas. If so, there is perhaps nothing in the decrees of the council which would positively condemn at any rate the High Church section of the English Church.\* Possibly even Lutheranism in its Swedish form might escape. It asserts baptismal regeneration and the necessity of episcopacy, and it denies the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. It asserts seven sacraments, but we cannot help thinking that that controversy, at all events, is a verbal one.† There is only one im-

---

\* It is worth noticing, on the other hand, that the articles of the Church of England, while attributing error to all the other ancient Patriarchal churches, seem pointedly to abstain from censuring that of Byzantium. 'As the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred' [doubtless in the Nestorian and Monophysite disputes], 'so also the Church of Rome hath erred.' But no English clergyman is committed to the position that the 'Church of Constantinople hath erred.'

† The Anglican definition of a sacrament includes its being 'generally necessary to salvation.' No Roman Catholic believes this of Orders or Matrimony.

portant point on which there seems an irreconcilable difference between the Eastern Church and the most High Church Protestant. Invocation of saints is clearly asserted by her formularies, and from invocation of saints practically follows that excessive reverence for pictures which is even more repulsive to Protestant feelings. But it does not follow that condemnation is pronounced on the rejection of this practice. And the Orthodox Church may plead, as even Rome may to some extent, that her formal teaching on these points differs widely from the superstitions popular among her members. The formal Confession of the Eastern Church in no way obscures the one Mediatorship of the Redeemer; it simply teaches that the saints may be piously invoked as intercessors. The probability is that the sentiment of a quasi-polytheism is too deeply engrained in the mind of southern Europe to be eradicated by any theological teaching.

Since the seventeenth century, there has been but little direct intercourse between the Orthodox East and the Protestant West. The bishops of the non-juring secession in England made a futile attempt to obtain their recognition by the Russian Church, which M. Mouravieff has somewhat strangely mistaken for a regular movement on the part of the Church of England. But the great events of the last few years, which have opened for England such a career in the East, cannot fail to bring the subject very prominently before every one who pays real attention to such matters. The greatest danger is from ignorance on both sides. The common English Protestant knows nothing of the Eastern churches, and can hardly be made to understand the difference between a Greek and a Papist. The Orthodox, again, are seldom aware how much the episcopal Protestant churches retain in common with themselves; how, in by far the greatest number of disputed points, Greece, England, and Scandinavia agree against Rome. To remove ignorance of this kind is surely a laudable and Christian work. And we have a class of men who seem specially called upon to undertake it. Almost every man who thinks on religious matters at all has a tendency towards either 'High Church' or 'Low Church.' In a communion like our own, whose ritual and articles are so plainly the result of a compromise, both will assuredly always exist. And more than that, for a good while to come, both ought to exist. Each has its appropriate sphere of usefulness both within and without the pale of the English Church. The really moderate and rational members of both parties may do good service by promising Christian fellowship in different directions. The 'Evangelical' naturally feels

most sympathy with foreign Protestants; while the 'Anglican' (not the Romanizer) feels an irresistible attraction towards the ancient churches of the East.

The policy of English churchmen is not to proselytise, but simply to exhibit their own system, in its best colours, before the eyes of Eastern Christians. Such was the original design of the Jerusalem Bishopric, though it has latterly been perverted from that intention. The same friendly policy has been carried out in Mr. Hill's admirable schools at Athens, which, we believe, have never given any offence to the Greek authorities. A noble opportunity now presents itself in the memorial church about to be erected at Constantinople. That monument to the brave men who died in the late war ought to become a centre, not of proselytism, but of friendly intercourse with the members of the ancient churches of the East. There they ought to behold a communion, united with them in opposition to Roman corruptions and usurpations, exhibited in its fairest and most friendly light\*; and we learn with great satisfaction, at the moment we are terminating this inquiry, that the Sultan has recently assigned a conspicuous site upon the hills which crown the Bosphorus to this interesting trophy of our heroism and our faith.

---

\* We have placed at the head of this article the names of two or three small publications of a character too distinctly theological to allow us to consider them at any length. The pamphlet headed 'Papal Aggression in the East,' is attributed to Bishop Wordsworth of Perth. It is well worth reading, as a clear exposition, from the point of view of a moderate High Churchman, of the points of agreement and difference between Greece, Rome, and England. A valuable article on the same subject will also be found in 'the Colonial Church Chronicle' for September, 1856. Mr. Meyrick's little volume is part of his well-intentioned series designed to spread better information on the Continent, with regard to English ecclesiastical matters. He of course exhibits the English Church as depicted by her divines of the High Church class; but to this, as we said above, we make no sort of objection. His Greek volume both deserves, and may expect to attain, greater success than is likely to fall to the lot of those which are designed for the enlightenment of Roman Catholic Europe. With the Orthodox he has a common ground, which he has not with any spiritual subject of the Bishop of Rome. His book seems well adapted to answer his purpose, if he can only make his Greek readers understand that his object is in no way to beguile them from the Orthodox Communion. His design, as we understand it, is simply to show that there are fewer impediments than are generally thought on both sides, to a fraternal union between the Greek and English Churches, without either surrendering its national peculiarities. In this design we wish him success.

ART. III.—*Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire (faisant suite à l'Histoire de la Révolution Française)*. Par Monsieur A. THIERS. 17 vols. Paris: 1845-58.

AFTER a labour extended over eighteen years, M. Thiers has at length accomplished his design, to write the history of France during the greatest epoch of her annals; and he has accomplished it with a brilliancy of execution and a vivacity of narration which have captivated the attention of Europe and raised an enduring monument to his literary fame. He has unquestionably surpassed all his predecessors in the ease and vigour of his style, in his descriptive power, in his delineation of the character of Napoleon, in his view of the organisation and inner life of the First Empire. Nor is it difficult to determine the cause of the extensive popularity of this work. It is the picture of the French Empire, and the apotheosis of its chief. The representation indeed may not always be accurate, and the panegyric not always just. But even its inconsistencies and exaggerations fall in with the sympathies of France in this generation for a period of French history, of which the sufferings are forgotten, and the triumphs are adored. In that country, therefore, its popularity gains from sentiment what its credit loses from analysis. But whilst we enter upon a review of this important production, with a strong sense of the inspiration the historian has drawn from his heroic theme, and of the amazing industry he has bestowed on this composition, we must be permitted to try its value by a different standard and a severer test. A work of this kind especially invites the criticism of foreign nations; and the success it owes to national predilections or contemporary passions can only be rendered permanent by the higher qualities of fidelity and truth. Never was it more important than at the present time that the past and present spirit of the French Empire and of its great founder should be considered and understood, and neither M. Thiers nor those who may criticise his writings can be expected to dismiss from their minds the obvious and direct bearing of this history on the other States of Europe.

The institution of the Consulate represented that period of Continental politics which confirmed the overthrow of prescriptive power and organised the Revolution. The triumph of lawless energy in France had had its counterpart in the decline of established institutions beyond the Rhine. The long and doubtful struggle which had preceded the peace of Luneville had finally

established France without an equal on the mainland, and England without an equal on the sea. The military power to which change and insecurity had given birth had conquered change and insecurity in its turn. The national acquiescence of the French people in the Consulate was the instinct of Revolution to institute its government and to impersonate its glory. Change was now allied with tradition, and disharmony was replaced by order. The Code incorporated what was just in the ancient laws of the realm with what was essential to renovated society. The Concordat acknowledged the rights of the Papacy, as distinguished from a principle of spiritual independence; and the rights of Christianity, as distinguished from a principle of national irreligion. The Empire of 1804 associated the Revolution with the sanction of conquest, as the marriage of 1810 afterwards associated it with the sovereign houses of Europe. The aristocracy of birth was again united with the aristocracy of intellect and of arms. The soldiers of fortune became the dukes of the empire. Thus the elements of progressive restoration became the attributes of reconstructed monarchy. But by degrees the interest of the nation was lost in that of the Ruler. The magnificent problem of the Empire, — to ally its existence with the interests of civilisation, was abandoned for a policy which, in commerce and in war, eventually annihilated its own power. The sentiment of martial glory was quenched in a sense of moral degradation; and the pride of external power mocked the national servility. Meanwhile the other Continental Powers, which had been ruined one by one in proportion to French exaction and their own disunion, were at length inspired by the heroic spirit which had never left our shores, and followed in the train of England to vindicate her principles, to reward her constancy, and to liberate Europe.

It is through this period, crowded with unexampled events, that M. Thiers aims to portray the reconstruction of a national polity in France, to follow the career of French conquest, and incidentally to describe English government and English character. The task demands not simply great capacity, but also extraordinary attainments. No other era is so rich in the grandest elements of history, and yet so difficult from its novelty and extent. The continental preeminence of Imperial France involved her history, more deeply than at any former period, with the records of every other State; and the protracted struggle between conquest and subjection, from which this preeminence arose, called widely into play the national character of every other people. A history therefore of the Consulate and the Empire cannot be exclusively based upon a knowledge of French

records and of French character. It must embrace the annals of Germany, of Spain, of Russia, especially of England; and an equal acquaintance with the popular idiosyncrasies which, in each country, have largely affected the course of events. A history of France under the Consulate and the Empire is a history of Europe; but unfortunately this history, whether it proceed from the pen of a Thiers or of an Alison, has as yet only been written under the strongest influence of national prejudice. It is but just however, within a certain limit, to be tolerant of error as we follow M. Thiers from domestic into foreign politics: and the tolerance which we think just and fair, presents a mean between the author's frequent travesty of European history, and the rigorous conditions of historic writing which he has himself theoretically laid down.

'One might, I acknowledge,' says M. Thiers, in the preface to his twelfth volume, 'proceed more rapidly; but I entertain that respect for the mission of history, that the fear of alleging what is inexact fills me with a sort of confusion. I have then no peace, because I have not discovered the proof of the fixed object of my doubts: I search for it everywhere; I do not stop till I have found it, or until I have acquired a certainty that it does not exist. In this case, compelled to pronounce as a juror, I speak according to my intimate belief, but always with an extreme fear of being in error, because I hold that there is nothing more to be condemned, since one assumes spontaneously the mission to speak truth to men on the great events of history, than to gloss it over by cowardice, to distort it by passion, to forge it by indolence, and to misstate, knowingly or not, to one's own age, and to ages to come.

'It is under the dominion of these scruples that I have read, read again, and annotated with my own hand, the innumerable papers contained in the archives of the State, the thirty thousand letters forming the personal correspondence of Napoleon, the no less numerous letters of his ministers, of his generals, of his aides-de-camp, and even of his agents of police, in fine the greater part of the manuscript memoirs preserved in the bosom of families. I have experienced—I owe the acknowledgment—under every government (for I have already witnessed three in succession since my work was begun) an equal facility, an equal prodigality in furnishing me with the documents of which I had need; and under the nephew of Napoleon, I have no more been refused the secrets of imperial policy than under the republic or under the constitutional monarchy.' (Vol. xii. pp. ii. iii.)

We look upon the preface or vindication from which we have made this extract, at once as the most striking example of the author's talents and as the severest sarcasm on his own work. None can dispute his view of the high mission of history. But the theory of his preface becomes the crucible of his reputation.

In that preface he has aptly said that the historic differs from the imaginative in writing, as the portraits differ from the inventive pictures of Raphael; and that as the portraits of the painter rank equal to his finest Madonnas, so true history may rival the finest works of the imagination. But in spite of these pretensions to truth and accuracy, we shall be compelled to acknowledge in the course of these remarks that M. Thiers has himself judged his history by a standard which it does not reach. He tells us again, that the problems presented by the career of Napoleon are to be solved only by extinguishing all passion in one's soul; yet his history betrays an inveterate bias. He 'experiences a sort of shame at the bare idea of alleging what is inexact; and experiences it not less at the bare idea of injustice towards men;'—yet it might have been supposed that, before he had reached his twelfth volume, this innocence had been worn away under the influence of a contrary tendency. 'History (he adds) says not, I am fiction, but says, I am truth;'—yet his writings, as will be seen, contain fiction largely intermingled with truth. He justly compares the first condition of a historian to that idolatrous love of the true, which painters and sculptors term the love of Nature;—yet his errors imply that he may sometimes have worshipped in an equal misconception of the nature of his idol, with the knight-errant in the simile of Bolingbroke, 'who, thinking himself happy in the arms of a celestial nymph, found all the while that he was the miserable slave of an infernal hag.'

We readily concede that M. Thiers may on certain subjects have penetrated more deeply than any other writer into the unpublished records of the French Empire, and into the history of its domestic organisation. But throughout his volumes scarcely a single document is produced and scarcely a single authority is cited. Where his statements are based upon the testimony of the French archives, he is perhaps content to await its complete publication. But he must remember that the disposition of the world to measure the presumptive accuracy of his writings where his authorities are withheld, by their accuracy where original and certain statements are already public, is as inevitable as it is also just. It will be seen that several official documents of the French Empire which are before the world, and are of equal authority with any to which he can have had access, directly contradict his assertions. It will be seen also that of the French documents which he produces in evidence of new and paradoxical positions, as the result of a search into the French archives, many are already to be found in such writings as those of Faïn and Bignon. We will not, indeed,



depreciate his researches, but we cannot concede to him the claim of dogmatic infallibility.

The part taken by this country in the great contests of the French Revolution had this inevitable consequence—that the history of England became mingled with that of every continental State. It followed, therefore, that the policy of every country of Europe is largely illustrated by our own records. And as our historic relations with France, both of peace and of war, were more prominent than those of any other country, it follows also that some of the main elements of French external history are to be found in English literature and English archives. M. Thiers undoubtedly has not underrated the importance of our relations with the Consulate and the Empire, if we judge from the extent to which he has treated of English history. But this conception of the magnitude of our position in the European system has extended the scope of his inaccuracies, and rendered more apparent his less than superficial acquaintance with our literature, our government, our society, and our character.

It will not be expected that a foreign historian should be versed in the archives of England; but it may fairly be demanded that he should be acquainted with our public literature. The internal evidence of this history implies that its author has not consulted a single work or document of authority in the English language. M. Thiers has obviously treated our domestic and diplomatic history without reference either to the 'Diaries of Lord Malmesbury,' to the 'Memorials of Mr. Fox,' to the 'Life of Lord Sidmouth,' to either of the two collections of the Duke of Buckingham, to the 'Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh,' or to the 'Memoirs of Sir Robert Adair.' He has as obviously treated our naval and military history, without reference to the 'Despatches of Lord Nelson,' to the 'Life of Lord Collingwood,' to the 'History of the Peninsular War' by Sir William Napier, to the history of that war by Lord Londonderry, or to the 'Despatches of the Duke of Wellington.\*' He has not even referred to the 'Parliamentary History,' or the 'Annual Register.'

This is equally true where English literature illustrates German history; and M. Thiers has described the campaigns of Dresden and of Leipzig without reference either to the work of Lord Londonderry, or to that of Sir George Cathcart, who, on the side of the Allies, are two most competent witnesses.

---

\* All of these works were published previously to the current editions of M. Thiers' History, and nearly all before the volumes to which they relate were first written.

Even in continental literature, we see little indication that he has read such well-known military writings as those of Jomini and St. Cyr, or such well-known political writings as those of Hardenberg and Gentz. And he is inferior to Sir A. Alison in the use of materials derived from the German commentators on the wars of the Empire.

The method by which M. Thiers has endeavoured to fill this chasm in his historic knowledge or his personal qualifications, is by turning from the imperial archives to the columns of the *Moniteur*—a retrocession from the defective light of French records into the outer darkness of a mendacious journal. It is thus that he describes as ‘brutal’ one of the most polished despatches of Lord Grenville, and one of the ablest arguments of Mr. Pitt. His misconception of our government is equal to his ignorance of our literature. It is thus that he remarks on the anomaly that the Opposition in the House of Commons once carried a more monarchical resolution than the Cabinet desired; as though he deemed the Ministers *ex officio* Tories, and the leaders of Opposition necessarily Whigs. His notion of the character of our leading men is as oblique as that of our national institutions. It is thus that he ascribes the march of the Duke of Wellington upon Madrid, after Salamanca, in 1812, to personal vanity, such as has been often charged upon the French marshals; although he elaborately vindicates, on political grounds, the attempted march of Napoleon on Berlin, in the following year, which was executed at the cost of his military strategy. This ignorance, which extends to the national character of all foreign countries, preeminently unfits M. Thiers to comprehend or to describe the motives and the actions of the English people.

To say the truth, M. Thiers can neither appreciate the moral principles which dictated our antagonism to France, nor acknowledge our military rivalry with her. He mistakes heroic constancy for inveterate rancour; and he describes the contests of which we yet reap the fruit as of doubtful issue; and the victories of which we are most proud as an inglorious success. It was the distinctive pride of England that she fought not for conquest, but for peace. It was her pride that she waged war under an isolation such as France never experienced, against confederacies more formidable than those over which France ever triumphed, and won victories more solid and more durable than those which France ever attained.

These are truths of easy demonstration. The victories of England over hostile confederacies by sea, kept pace with the victories of France over hostile confederacies by land; and the

French military career was declining when the English military career began. France, since the institution of the Directory, was never without allies by land; England, in the same period, rarely possessed a maritime alliance. The victory of Trafalgar left results which have survived the lapse of half a century; but the results of the victory of Austerlitz had ceased before Waterloo had been fought.

It is not our wish to renew this controversy in an age in which ancient rivalry has given place, we hope, to perpetual alliance. But its revival does not originate with ourselves; and we hold a yet more solemn covenant with the memory of our grandsires than even with the friendships of our own day. M. Thiers, while he asserts that the historian is not bound by any precedent in his method of writing, lays it down, as a condition of style, that it should be neither detected nor perceived; and this he compares, with great force and justice, to that glass of absolute transparency whose merit would be lost if the eye were to suspect its presence. Considered as a mere literary composition, his work undoubtedly possesses very high merits. His style has not the brevity or force of the great masters of the art of writing, but it is always limpid, rapid, lively, and agreeable, and one can hardly give it higher praise than by saying that it sometimes reminds us of the style of Voltaire. A severe revision of the text might, however, considerably improve it. Here and there we are struck with inaccuracies of language which even a foreigner can detect; in some places the tone is trivial, and the expression vulgar; and throughout the book there is a ludicrous recurrence of certain adverbs, which invariably do duty in every similar situation of affairs. From the moment that the French armies found themselves in presence of men who could sometimes defeat them, the word '*malheureusement*' occurs in almost every page, and accounts for every disaster. These are but slight blemishes in so great a work; they might easily be removed; but they are characteristic of the carelessness with which some parts of it appear to have been written. But there is one condition more inexorable than all, — that history should be true.

It would be unjust, in criticising an author who had traced the anarchy of the Revolution, to be altogether intolerant of his bias towards a chief whose early youth led the French people at once to government and to glory, and combined the military tactics of Hannibal with the administrative genius of the First Cæsar. The early administration of Napoleon was probably a greater achievement than his rise to the supreme power. The incidents of the age had conquered the disadvantages of birth,

while the power of the army had choked the popular voice; and the devastating career of the Revolution left power nearly as open to preeminent ability as it had previously been open to hereditary right. It was, in our view, a harder problem to construct a system of government where all prescription had been flung away, and where all moral sanctions had been renounced, than to conquer the armies of the Germanic Empire. Those who remember that the administrative institutions of the First Empire survived it, outlived the Constitutional Monarchy, and aided the restoration of the Imperial form of government, will acknowledge that it failed rather from the abuse of its power than from the defects of its conception.

Yet it is a cardinal inconsistency, arising out of this very bias, that M. Thiers aims to be the national historian of France. He regards the whole triumph of the Empire as the joint glory of Napoleon and of his country. He scarcely recognises the divergence between the interests of France and those of its ruler, and he still more faintly indicates the growth of their dissociation. The fatal result of the personal ambition of Napoleon was, that he who became the greatest oppressor of Europe, became also the worst enemy of France. M. Thiers, therefore, as his history proceeds, is reduced to the dilemma of standing in antagonism either to his country or to his hero. This lofty individuality of Napoleon, springing from the dependence of the European system on himself, and rising into bolder prominence when the spirit of the Revolution had expired, invests the history of the Empire with the character of colossal biography.

M. Thiers will not acknowledge the truth, that each of the magnificent designs of Napoleon became successively a signal failure. Yet the idea of the French Empire is not to be compared to one of those gigantic structures which we see looming shadowy through the morning mist, and then dissipated as a baseless phantasm; the power that vanished into a splendid dream might have been an adamant reality. History knows no stranger sequel to so much of early promise and of amazing effort. The Concordat, which terminated in a simple antagonism between State and Church, might fairly have enabled the Civil Power to govern France through a national religion. The Continental System, which failed at once as an engine of offensive war and as an element of domestic wealth, might have been simply the artificial barrier of French commerce. The foreign alliances of the Empire, which were extorted by victories and were destructive of all permanent support, might have been based upon durable reciprocal interests. The popular enthusiasm, affection, and

confidence, of which Napoleon was the object until he had exhausted the very heart of the nation, might have laid the foundation of more liberal institutions, and of a more unselfish compact between the Sovereign and the country. Yet as the eventful drama advances from act to act, each year devours the last, and the catastrophe leaves the scene of so much glory encumbered with its ruins.

For the convenience of the observations we propose to make, it may be observed that the history of this period resolves itself into four principal divisions. The first extends from the institution of the Consulate to the battle of Trafalgar, the peace of Presburg, and the death of Mr. Pitt. The second comprehends the Ministry of Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville, the conquest of Prussia, the establishment of the Continental System, and the peace of Tilsit. The third is marked chiefly by the Peninsular War, the campaign of Wagram, and the Divorce. And the fourth by the Russian, German, and French campaigns of 1812, 1813, and 1814. We shall follow the author into each of these divisions; and in dealing with the first period, we shall confine ourselves to the political and the maritime events involved in the relations of France and England.

No clearer characteristic can be instanced of M. Thiers' erroneous conception of our foreign policy, than that he represents *money* as the spring of all our public resolutions. The question whether a policy of greater conciliation upon our part might originally have averted the French declaration of war against this country in 1793, is one on which we shall never probably be unanimous. But it will be generally acknowledged that the war was pursued by England for a great principle of morality and of justice. M. Thiers, on the other hand, ventures to assert that we made our national wealth our standard of right. The charge calls for no elaborate investigation; for M. Thiers meets his own theory with a precise and circumstantial refutation.

On this subject he advances four distinct propositions which with singular perspicuity eliminate each other. The first asserts that the Continental Powers in 1800 'were maintaining a resolute contest against the French Republic. *England, for whom war was nothing but a question of finance*, had solved this question for herself, in instituting the income tax, which 'already yielded an abundant revenue. *She therefore desired to prolong hostilities.*'\* This is proposition the first. M.

Thiers elsewhere corroborates this mercenary view of our political principles, by contrasting our belligerent policy in 1800 with the opposite policy which we pursued in an opposite financial condition, during the Lille negotiations of 1797. 'England, indeed,' (writes the author) '*had desired to treat, and to send Lord Malme-bury to Lille in 1797, because her finances were embarrassed.*'\* This is proposition the second. According to these two statements, then, our prosperity dictated the rejection of peace in 1800, and our poverty rendered sincere our negotiation in 1797.

The second volume contains M. Thiers' annihilation of his own hypothesis. We are there told that the charges on the British Treasury for the year 1800, notwithstanding the income tax, exceeded its revenue by 650 million francs, that its total expenditure rose to 1,723 millions, 'a sum enormous at any time, but especially in 1800.'† When, therefore, the author's desire of depicting us as an impoverished and insolvent nation preponderates over that of describing us as a mercenary belligerent Power, we are led to infer that our war-policy was maintained in spite of the severest financial burdens. Proposition the third thus destroys proposition the first. In the same volume, again, we are told, in reference to the acceptance of peace by Buonaparte, in 1801, 'that the remembrance of the negotiation of Lord Malme-bury, in 1797, *which had been but an empty demonstration on the part of Mr. Pitt*, had left on the mind of the First Consul an irritating impression.'‡ When, therefore, the author's desire of reproaching our insincerity preponderates in turn over that of denouncing our rancour, we are told that the negotiation which fiscal difficulties had dictated in 1797, was simply fictitious and illusive! Proposition the fourth thus destroys proposition the second.

Take next an instance of misconception in regard both to our polity and our public men. M. Thiers' view of our rejection of the overtures of Buonaparte in 1800, illustrates both these points. He first refers their rejection to the fact that 'war coincided with the passions and interests of Mr. Pitt,' who had 'made war with France the basis of his political existence,' and who, if peace had been restored, 'would perhaps have been compelled to retire.' He next criticises the discourtesy of the British Government in communicating, by a note from Lord Grenville to Talleyrand, their answer to the overture which Buonaparte had addressed directly to George III.

It is superfluous to refute the former charge against Pitt.

---

\* Vol. i. p. 177.

† Vol. ii. p. 382.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 449.

We believe that no Minister who has governed England during the last hundred years was ever guilty of making or prolonging war upon any other than national and moral grounds. But a more distorted portraiture was probably never drawn. Pitt had been Minister during nearly ten years of peace, previous to the French declaration of war against this country, in 1793. No one had been more anxious for the success of the Lille negotiation in 1797, which is first termed by M. Thiers a fiscal necessity and then a diplomatic sham, than Pitt himself. If M. Thiers had read Lord Malmesbury's 'Diaries,' he would have known that, had the points at issue in that negotiation been narrowed to the cession of the Cape or Ceylon, Pitt was ready to have yielded upon either of these questions, in defiance of the opposition of Lord Grenville, who would have quitted the Cabinet.\* He next, as we have seen, rests the invincible hostility of Pitt towards the French Government on the ministerial answer returned to the overtures of the First Consul. He here shows an ignorance of the plainest principles of the British Constitution. He is not apparently aware that a direct answer from the King of Great Britain to the head of the French Executive would have been no more binding on the British Government, than a judicial opinion of the King upon a lawsuit in Westminster Hall would have bound his Court of Chancery or his Court of King's Bench.

We have taken an instance or two of M. Thiers' self-contradiction, and an instance or two of his misconceptions: we will take next an instance of his deliberate injustice. 'Mr. Pitt' (he writes), 'by his brutal manner of replying to the French overtures, drew upon himself just and well founded attacks.' He publishes *in extenso* both the original overture and the rejoinder of the French Government, but he withholds the intervening reply of Lord Grenville. He publishes *in extenso* the speeches of Fox, Sheridan, and Tierney, on the question of peace; and he omits the answer of Pitt, which forms the vindication of the obnoxious despatch. It is possible that he may have found in the *Moniteur*, 'his cloudy pillar and his guardian fire,' neither Mr. Pitt's speech nor Lord Grenville's note. An official journal of the day is certainly not likely to be more dispassionate than a historian in the next half century. But the inference remains that M. Thiers has reprobated what he has not read, on the authority of a journal notorious for its official falsehood.

Credulity is not less a prominent characteristic of M. Thiers

---

\* Malmesbury's *Diaries*, iv. 128.

than his inconsistency, his misconception, and his partisanship. He describes with almost a vindictive satisfaction a '*bouleversement social*' by the English populace, whom he asserts to have 'pillaged the fair dwellings of the aristocracy in the country,' in consequence of the suffering to which they were reduced by the rejection of peace. Here he sees the just retribution of England. It happens that this is the romantic exaggeration of a distress chiefly originating in a failure of domestic crops, and following too closely our refusal to negotiate to have been appreciably lessened by a pacification founded on the French overture. It is strange that a writer naturally so acute as M. Thiers does not perceive the practical difficulty of negotiating with Buonaparte early in 1800. He had but just usurped power with antecedents which, as far as they were known, did not raise him in the eyes of foreign countries much above the notorious profligacy of the French directors. The success of his usurpation was then improbable. The recognition of his acts by a succeeding government was still more so. In the happy antithesis of Seneca, '*Antonius hostis à republicâ judicatus, nunc hostem rempublicam judicat.*' It required at that moment more than ordinary sagacity to discover that the Revolution, which had till then devoured all her children, had at last found a responsible chief and a master.

Turn now to his picture of the continental alliances arrayed against us. It is but a fair instance of the resolute obliquity of his historic vision, that every maritime confederacy formed against this country, and over which this country triumphed, is made a reproach against us; while every territorial confederacy which France encountered and defeated, adds a chaplet to her glory. In the latter instance the author looks clearly forward to the issue; in the former he carefully bounds his vision to the formation of the confederacy itself. Marengo and Copenhagen illustrate this inconsistency. 'Mr. Pitt' (writes M. Thiers), 'in not having been willing to treat before Marengo, and General Buonaparte in having disarmed one part of Europe by his victories, and turned the other against England by his policy, were both incontestably the authors of this prodigious change of fortune.' The author's contrast adroitly closes immediately before the battles of Copenhagen and Alexandria.

The misconceptions of M. Thiers upon this head are nearly innumerable. Take, for instance, the grounds of Pitt's resignation in 1801. On this question he asserts that he has authentic information. 'Mr. Pitt,' he says, 'foresaw neither the peace nor its disruption.' Canning tells us, on the contrary, that Pitt acknowledged to him in 1802, 'that had he remained



'in power, he felt it would have been necessary to recur to a 'pacific negotiation.' Again, he perpetually describes Pitt's conduct when out of office as an intrigue for the resumption of power; whereas the authentic records of his life, which we had occasion to examine minutely in our last Number, prove that his conduct was regulated by wholly different motives. He revives the exploded story that our Government had supported the designs of the French refugees, which it is now unnecessary to refute, although we have lived to see this very question of refugees resume some of the adventitious importance it acquired shortly before the rupture of the Peace of Amiens. He even countenances the ridiculous statement that the British general, Stuart, had attempted to assassinate the French general, Sebastiani. He reproduces the calumny of the *Moniteur*, that the conspiracy against the life of Paul originated with this Court. If he had read Lord Malmesbury's Journals, he would no doubt have reproduced also with infinite satisfaction the idle story, that three Scotch doctors were in at the imperial death, and dissected the murdered Czar.

'Le Ministère Addington,' says M. Thiers, 'payait encore Georges Cadoudal dont la persévérance à conspirer était connu; il mettait à sa disposition des sommes considérables pour l'entretien des sicaires dont la troupe courait sans cesse de Portsmouth à Jersey, de Jersey sur la côte de Bretagne.' (Vol. iv. p. 225.)

These are M. Thiers' views of our Government and our character, — these the Rafaellesque portraits which are to rival the best 'Virgins' of imaginative literature! Let us see if his portraits of the naval and military actions of the same period are more faithful. Take the battle of Copenhagen in 1801. M. Thiers is here not alone grossly inaccurate in his statements, but even inconsistent in his inaccuracy. He describes this battle as a victory snatched from an impending defeat, such as he has himself described the battles of Arcola and Marengo to be; and he attempts to discredit the British navy for that very change of threatened disaster into ultimate success for which he has justly praised the French commander. Let us compare his statement with the despatches of Lord Nelson, and even with the history of Jomini.

It is clear that M. Thiers has blindly copied the official fabrication of Commodore Fischer, the Danish Commander-in-Chief, — a coward who fled from the action in such haste that he forgot to strike his broad-pendant as he left his ship, and whom Lord Nelson, on her surrender, consequently claimed as a prisoner of war on shore. In that fabrication, which is to be found in the Nelson Despatches, it is asserted that 'Nelson had

‘twelve ships of the line and several frigates.’ M. Thiers repeats the same statement, adding that they were all in action by ten o’clock. ‘We had,’ answered Nelson, in his reply to General Lindholm, ‘only five seventy-fours, two sixty-fours, two fifties, and one frigate engaged. Two seventy-fours and one sixty-four by an accident grounded on the Crown Islands.’ So much for the accuracy of the original computation of force.

M. Thiers thus describes the issue:—

‘Nelson, nearly vanquished, was not dismayed, and resolved to send a flag of truce to the Prince of Denmark, who took part in this horrible scene at one of the batteries.

‘The Prince, wavering under this frightful spectacle, fearing for the city of Copenhagen, now deprived of the succour of the floating batteries, ordered a suspension of fire. This was an error: for a few instants more, and Nelson’s fleet, almost put hors-de-combat, would have been obliged to retreat half destroyed.’ (Vol. ii. p. 416.)

Again:—

‘But the English fleet had been terribly maltreated; and, but for the too great haste of the Prince Royal of Denmark to listen to Nelson’s flag of truce, it would probably have succumbed. The victory, then, had been almost a defeat; and moreover, the result arrived at was not considerable.’ (Vol. ii. p. 440.)

The whole of this statement is full of daring assertions. Apart from the testimony of Nelson or Jomini of the relative condition of the two fleets, their position shows that the action had ceased *of necessity*, as between the British ships and the mainland, when the flag of truce was sent on shore. The intervention of the Danish ships between the British fleet and the land batteries precluded the interchange of shots except through these very ships. These intervening ships were at once British prizes filled with Danish subjects, for ‘the Danish fleet,’ as Jomini himself acknowledges, ‘had mostly struck before Nelson had sent the flag of truce.’\* Denmark was not more willing to fire on her own countrymen than Nelson on his own prisoners. Lord Nelson’s letter to General Lindholm conclusively refutes M. Thiers’ view, that his transmission of a flag of truce was a politic manœuvre. ‘The commodore,’ answered Nelson, ‘seems to exult that I sent on shore a flag of truce. Men of his description, if they ever are victorious, know not the feelings of humanity. You know, and His Royal Highness knows, that the guns fired from the shore could only fire

---

\* Jomini, Hist. vol. xiv. p. 260.

‘through the Danish ships, which had surrendered; so that if I fired at the shore, it could only be in the same manner.’\*

Turn next to Nelson's attack on Boulogne, and to M. Thiers' extravagant assertion that its failure produced the peace of Amiens. He states that there were two attacks on that port — on the 4th and 16th of August, 1801. The first — which, according to Nelson, was a mere reconnaissance, resulting, nevertheless, in the sinking or grounding of eleven out of twenty-four assailable vessels, without involving any injury to ourselves † — is described by M. Thiers as a ‘bombardment’ during sixteen hours, without causing any injury to the ‘French.’ ‡

Of the *second* attack M. Thiers says, —

‘The English saw themselves everywhere repulsed: *the sea was covered with their floating corpses*; and a good number of their boats were either lost or taken.’ (Vol. iii. p. 174.)

Æschylus is more descriptive of the battle of Salamis than M. Thiers of the battle of Boulogne. When the Greek wrote the description of the Persian disaster which M. Thiers appears to have adopted for the English action, —

φίλων  
ἀλίδουα σώματα πολυξαφῇ  
καθανόντα λέγει φέρεσθαι  
πλαγκτοῖς ἐν ὀπλάεσσιν —

he asserted what was probably no more than literally true. But if we refer to Nelson's despatch, we shall find, not only that none of our boats were taken at Boulogne, but that the total of our killed (few of whom probably fell overboard in the action) was *forty-four*. §

It would be an abuse of argument to notice the assertion that the ill-success of this attack induced us to sue for peace; further than to observe that, whereas this action was fought on the 16th of August, the detailed proposition of a peace, arranged between M. Otto and Lord Hawkesbury, is dated the 23rd of July. He must be a bold advocate who will fortify an egregious misconception of a naval action by an equally glaring anachronism.

Take one other instance in this period. It shall be Trafalgar, the greatest perhaps of all the achievements of our arms. Here M. Thiers, after an elaborate depreciation of a victory which even his ingenuity cannot quite distort into a defeat, draws

\* Nelson's Despatches, vol. iv. p. 344.

† The same, vol. iv. p. 440.

‡ Thiers, vol. iii. p. 169.

§ Nels. Desp., vol. iv. p. 468.

great solace from the reflection that Trafalgar was obliterated by Ulm, a victory won on the previous day in the heart of Europe and therefore generally known during a considerable period before the 'forgotten battle' was made public.

The French historian's narrative forms a succession of distinct assertions, each more inaccurate than the preceding one.

1. 'Moreover,' he says, 'although the English had twenty-seven ships and ourselves thirty-three, they possessed the same number of guns, and therefore an equal force.\*' It appears, on the contrary, from the last volume of the 'Nelson Despatches,' that the guns of the English fleet were 2148, and the guns of the combined fleet 2634.† According, therefore, to M. Thiers' own estimate of force, the allies were more powerful in a nearly exact proportion to the relative number of their ships. The British, moreover, who captured twenty-four out of their thirty-three line-of-battle ships, were better judges of the number of guns on either side than the allies, who did not board one of ours.

2. M. Thiers' next position is, that at any rate the allies were inferior in the engagement, since 'ten French ships, forming the van, remained inactive,' while the British fleet was almost simultaneously concentrated. 'The northern column, commanded by Nelson, came up twenty or thirty minutes after that of Collingwood.' (P. 153.) Now it happens that only four out of these ten French ships escaped uninjured; and that while the author himself acknowledges that the action, on the part of Collingwood's column, began at eleven (p. 150.), our own official despatches assert that the 'Victory' did not open fire till one. Nelson, they inform us, was six miles distant when the action began, and the wind meanwhile entirely sank. The disproportion, therefore, of the British, during a great part of the action, was by much greater than even their total disproportion on the sea.

3. M. Thiers next takes refuge in single combats. He tells us that the French 'Bucentaur' was simultaneously attacked by four ships; and he does not tell us that the 'Royal Sovereign,' which bore Collingwood's flag, sustained the reception of the allies, unsupported by any ship within a mile. He asserts that the 'defeat of the French fleet was heroic, perhaps, without an equal in history, and deserved to be cited beside the triumph of Ulm;' but he has already cited Ulm as the triumph by which the victory itself of Trafalgar is to be tested and obliterated.

\* Thiers, vol. vi. p. 151.

† Nels. Desp., vol. vii. p. 141, 220.

4. M. Thiers yet more widely misconceives the dastardly conduct of Dumanoir, whom he represents as making with his four ships 'for the rear-guard, where sixteen French and Spanish ships were engaged with Collingwood's column. . . . Discouraged by the fire which threatened his division, and consulting prudence more than desperation, *he did nothing.*' (P. 165.) What he *did* is recorded with invincible circumstantiality. The continuance of the engagement, and therefore Dumanoir's scheme of sharing it, is an entire error. The allied ships in question, according to every testimony, had already struck: Dumanoir poured his broadsides into friend and foe; and the Spanish prisoners were permitted to return his fire. M. Thiers adds, that he made his escape through the Straits. The vanishing point is happily chosen. M. Thiers has perhaps forgotten that his whole squadron was captured in the Mediterranean by Admiral Strachan.

5. The author's view of the results of this battle is still more inaccurate. 'The allied fleet,' he observes, 'lost six or seven thousand in killed, wounded, and prisoners.' (P. 172.) Lord Collingwood asserts that he took 20,000 prisoners alone.\* The author adds, that we made one admiral prisoner: we made three, Villeneuve, Alava, and Cisneros. He says, that our losses were 3000: they were 1690. He applauds 'the heroic escape of the "Algésiras:"' she rose upon her captors after her surrender. He asserts that 'of the seventeen ships which we captured, nearly all escaped us' in a storm. It is obvious that the sinking of ships already half wrecks, which is gracefully designated as an 'escape,' involved no appreciable diminution of success. He speaks of sixteen ships as remaining to the allies. An analysis of their fleet, drawn from Collingwood's despatches—which accounts for twenty burnt, wrecked, or taken at Trafalgar, four afterwards taken by Sir R. Strachan, two escaped after capture dismasted, and three entire wrecks escaped to Cadiz—leaves four available ships to the two nations as the result of the battle of Trafalgar.

These criticisms suffice to indicate the degree of accuracy with which M. Thiers describes our naval victories. We might pursue the inquiry in regard to other actions if it were necessary, with the aid both of public authority and of private testimony.

We now pass to the second of these four periods, that which is presented by the years 1806–7.

---

\* Nels. Desp. vol. vii. p. 235.

No student of European history in the age of the Empire can have failed to perceive that the year 1806 formed a distinct era in the general system of the Continent and in the domestic and external politics of this country. The dissolution of the German Empire, and the creation of the Rhenish Confederacy, followed the battle of Austerlitz and the peace of Presburg. The fall of Prussia in the same year finally established the military and commercial dominion of France over Germany. The battle of Trafalgar, at the close of 1805, had nearly extinguished the maritime contest which had endured since the year 1793. Thus, since the institution of the Consulate, France and England, each upon her own element, rose from certain superiority to uncontested power. But while the maritime ascendancy of England had sprung from a contest for domestic independence, the military ascendancy of France had sprung from a contest for foreign supremacy. The success of France was, therefore, temporarily more productive than that of England; and her conquests created alliances which the ocean did not yield. The perils of England were not, therefore, allayed in proportion to the extent of her conquests by sea. As she triumphed on the ocean she became isolated by land; and the western continent was gradually moulding itself into a military empire, which received from Paris its alliances and its commercial laws.

Such was the state of Europe when Mr. Fox acceded to power in January 1806, after an exclusion of twenty-two years, and reverted to that scheme of peace with France which had been the dream and the ambition of his life. Between a French alliance and continental isolation it was already probable that no alternative was left to this country. The disasters of 1805 had swept away the elements of military confederacies abroad: Austria had received the law from France; the doubtful faith of Russia soon passed into open hostility; and the relations of the king of England with Prussia were unhappily the result of that scandalous act of bad faith — the occupation of Hanover. The restoration of an Anglo-French peace, under a government both conciliatory and firm, was now the greatest problem of the day. No passage of our modern history has, however, been more widely misapprehended.

It was the foreign policy of Lord Grenville's Ministry neither to pursue the principles adopted by Mr. Pitt, as M. Thiers has represented it, nor to abandon the Continent, as Sir A. Alison has chosen to repeat. The Cabinet of 1806 decided either to negotiate a general peace, or to prosecute the war with extraordinary vigour. But its prosecution was marked by this difference,

that English treasure was to be reserved for English military equipments, rather than lavished in disastrous subsidies to Powers whose sagacity we had always questioned, and whose good faith we soon saw plainly disproved.

M. Thiers appears to labour under the strange misconception that, while Napoleon in 1806 was earnestly desirous of restoring peace with England, his views were defeated by the triumph of an alleged war-party in Lord Grenville's Cabinet, after the death of Mr. Fox. We will take these two broad assertions singly. Their tendency is to throw into paradoxical contrast the aggressive designs of England and the pacific dreams of Buonaparte. M. Thiers thus describes the views of the Emperor:—

‘This proposal charmed Napoleon, who thoroughly desired a reconciliation with Great Britain; since it was from that country that all wars sprang, like a stream from its source; and there were few direct means of conquering her, one alone excepted, very decisive but very doubtful, and for Napoleon alone practicable—that of the invasion. He displayed a lively satisfaction with this frank overture, and received it with the greatest eagerness.’ (Vol. vi. p. 442.)

That Napoleon was really desirous of peace, at the outset of the negotiation, was not questioned by Lord Grenville's Cabinet, and has rarely been questioned since. But in the following passage, a doubt is thrown by M. Thiers himself on the good faith with which Buonaparte designed to conduct the negotiation:—

‘Napoleon clearly saw that in not precipitating negotiations, and in hastening, on the other hand, the execution of his projects, he would attain his double aim, of constituting his empire as he wished, and of consolidating it by general peace.’ (Vol. vi. p. 458.)

He here implies that Buonaparte designed to renew, during the negotiation, the Continental aggressions which he practised between the preliminaries and the peace of Amiens.

The conduct of Napoleon, in entertaining the English negotiation, was probably a consistent link, intervening between his naval confederacies and his continental system, in the policy of subjugating the Continent by first paralysing the influence of this country. His original scheme, to invade England during a temporary maritime supremacy—

“Such deep designs of empire doth he lay  
O'er them whose cause he seems to take in hand,  
And prudently would make them lords at sea  
To whom, with ease, he can give laws by land”—

had just vanished at Trafalgar. He now therefore designed not ‘general peace’ upon equal terms,—but the separation of

England from the Continental Powers, whose hostility to France such a separation would soon extinguish. \* But while this peace jointly with this separation was the aim of Buonaparte, a peace without a separation was the aim of Mr. Fox and of the Grenville Ministry. This difference is implied, if only in the desire of Buonaparte to negotiate with England singly, and in the resolution of Mr. Fox to negotiate jointly with Russia. The negotiation, on the part of the British Government, thus arose:—

A member of Lord Grenville's Cabinet called upon Mr. Fox during the afternoon of the day in which an impudent offer to assassinate Buonaparte had been made to him by a refugee. 'Something has happened this morning,' said Mr. Fox, to his colleague, 'which may tend towards an understanding with France.' Mr. Fox then detailed to his visitor the affair of the assassin. He added, 'whether we have any chance of peace or not, I cannot do otherwise than send word of this to Buonaparte; but (he pursued) while confining my remarks to this subject, I may treat it in such a manner as to lead him to suppose that he is mistaken as to the sentiments of hostility which he imagines to exist towards him in this country.'

The negotiation which thus originated M. Thiers has fallen into perhaps not unnatural inaccuracies in delineating. The Earl of Yarmouth (afterwards Marquess of Hertford), who had been a prisoner of war under the harsh edict of Napoleon in 1803, and had meanwhile become a friend of Talleyrand, was chosen by Mr. Fox to conduct the negotiation, which he afterwards vested virtually in the Earl of Lauderdale. M. Thiers, in strict adherence to his normal bias, praises Lord Yarmouth and depreciates Lord Lauderdale. The truth is that the former greatly exceeded his instructions; and Mr. Fox, unwilling to disgrace the original envoy, sent Lord Lauderdale to Paris, ostensibly as his colleague, while he invested that nobleman in fact with the entire control of the negotiation. Lauderdale therefore, when he reached Paris, was viewed by Talleyrand as an interloper who had thwarted the intrigues of the French Government. Hence apparently the odium which he encounters from M. Thiers. The author's view of Lord Yarmouth's abilities is also greatly overdrawn. Lord Yarmouth possessed much shrewdness, and was a master in that knowledge of the world which, no doubt, is of greater value than genius without social experience; but he was no equal to Talleyrand.

But the two principal distortions in this history, which gloss over the conduct of Napoleon, so far as the negotiation itself is concerned, are—*first*, that no understanding could



be arrived at with the English Government in regard to Sicily; and *secondly*, that Napoleon was justified in demanding that England and Russia should negotiate separately. These are quickly disposed of. The author describes Sicily as being 'throughout the insoluble question.' That question was insoluble simply through what Mr. Fox himself describes, in his despatches of the 3rd and 14th of August, as the 'tergiversation of France.' It is on record in those despatches that the surrender of Sicily to Naples was distinctly conceded by Talleyrand to Lord Yarmouth at the outset of the negotiation, under the phrase of 'uti possidetis,' and that the concession was afterwards repudiated. The second position—that of joint negotiation with Russia, is thus stated:—

'In regard to the intervention of Russia in the treaty, Napoleon positively declared that he would not consent to it. The principle of his diplomacy was that of separate pacifications; and this principle was as just as it was skilfully conceived. Europe had always employed the method of coalition against France. To admit collective negotiations would have been but to favour them; for this was to lend himself to the essential condition of every coalition, that which interdicted its members from treating singly.' (Vol. vi. p. 443.)

Now the first principle of the war waged by France against England, under every form of government, had been that of maritime coalitions; and it is obvious that the enforcing of a joint negotiation upon France was, according to M. Thiers' own reasoning, but an acceptance of the very principle on which France had acted. Napoleon, therefore, and his minister, resolved to separate Russia by an intrigue when they had failed to separate her by principle and reasoning. Mr. Fox, bound by honour yet more than by policy, refused to desert Russia in the negotiation. M. d'Oubril, the Russian Minister in Paris, on the contrary, did not scruple to desert this country, and signed a treaty of peace, on the 20th of July, in opposition to the representations of Lord Yarmouth, and even in defiance of his demand for a delay of forty-eight hours, which should elicit the opinion of the Russian ambassador in London. More faithful to the policy of this country and to the public interests of Europe, the emperor Alexander refused his ratification to the treaty.

The assertion of M. Thiers that the pacific views of Napoleon were defeated by the triumph of a war party in Lord Grenville's Cabinet, on the death of Mr. Fox, is equally incorrect. Mr. Fox's public charge of tergiversation against France, early in August, has been already quoted. But his views rest on private as well as on official testimony. Almost immediately

before his death, a member of the Cabinet called upon him on some other business just as he had received a decisive despatch from Paris. Mr. Fox, as he gave his visitor the despatch to read, said, 'I have got this letter from Lauderdale this morning. *I am afraid the negotiation is all at an end.*' And after a pause, as though offering his last charge to those who should represent his principles, he added, '*I am dying: you must keep together, and rely upon yourselves and upon each other, and carry on the war as vigorously as you can.*'

These, we believe, were the last words which Mr. Fox ever spoke upon foreign affairs. They equally refute the assertion of M. Thiers that Lord Grenville's Cabinet availed themselves of the death of Mr. Fox to prosecute the war, and the calumny of others that Mr. Fox was ready to sacrifice the honour to the peace of his country.

We now pass to the third period which this history suggests. The Peninsular War represents the commencement of the decline of the Empire. It originated in the most scandalous acts of intrigue and aggression against the independence of a foreign dynasty and a foreign nation; but these crimes brought their own punishment with them, and M. Thiers points out with great force the political errors and the administrative defects which converted Spain into the grave of the Imperial armies. In proportion as the Empire became poorer from domestic misgovernment, it became more heavily taxed for the support of foreign wars. The administrative genius of the French War Office forsook the Peninsular armies; and public official testimony records a condition of suffering and disaffection which had never before attended the French standards. The incessant defeats of the French armies compromised the reputation of the Empire, and the depopulation produced by immoderate levies exhausted the elements of military organisation. The resources of Napoleon grew therefore weaker in proportion as his operations were expanded; but admitting these causes of defeat, M. Thiers recoils from their inevitable consequences. He attempts to rescue at least the military reputation of France from the discredit which attaches to a long series of defeats, and his whole treatment of the Spanish campaigns is an elaborate attempt to disguise facts which no artifice can substantially alter or deny.

But M. Thiers' account of the political crimes of Bayonne and Aranjuez is marked by no such forbearance or insensibility. He has unravelled that dark web of intrigue with consummate ability; and, like M. de Talleyrand, he denounces the whole

policy of Napoleon to the Spanish Bourbons and the Spanish nation as the first of the enormous blunders which led to the destruction of the Empire and the humiliation of France. The two last books of the 8th volume, entitled 'Aranjuez and Bayonne,' are masterpieces of the narrative style, and no writer has exceeded the censure with which M. Thiers visits these transactions.

M. Thiers, in his picture of the movements and the strategy of the French commanders, is wonderfully graphic; and though he may be accused, in some portions of his vast labour, of an excessive propensity to military detail, — more especially in the campaign of Wagram, — yet he seldom fails to impart to his narrative of operations a high degree of perspicuity, and the brilliant colouring of an enthusiastic admirer of military prowess and military skill. But we regret to find, upon a careful comparison of his military criticisms with the authentic records of the same events published in other countries, that this perspicuity and this enthusiasm for military achievements desert him when he has to deal with the not less glorious efforts and exploits of foreign commanders and foreign armies — whether Austrian, Russian, Prussian, or British. Whenever he is compelled to choose between what he conceives to be the national pride of France and the evidence of historical truth, he either yields to the latter with a bad grace, or, as in some remarkable instances, evades it altogether. Thus he has dealt with the action of Sabugal in a general history, just as he has criticised Napoleon for dealing with the battle of Trafalgar in a daily journal. *He has omitted altogether* that which the Duke of Wellington asserted to have been 'one of the most glorious actions in which our troops were ever engaged,' in which we defeated General Regnier at the head of triple our own force, — ourselves sustaining a loss of only 200, and inflicting a loss of 1500 on the French. Such incidents at any rate raise a doubt, either of the minuteness of M. Thiers' investigation of French authentic records, or of the circumstantiality of those records themselves.

Nevertheless, we shall be ready to adopt the general principle, that French writers are the best exponents of French affairs, and the English writers of English. Occasionally we shall meet M. Thiers on the French side of his picture, with French documentary evidence directly opposed to his own unsupported assertions. It will be seen that his bias is sometimes personal as well as national; as his unjust attacks on the character, and his censure of the strategy, of Soult in 1812 very clearly indicate. But it will readily be acknowledged that he has drawn the most vivid existing picture of the administrative

difficulties and the strategical confusion of the French Peninsular armies.

It must not be supposed, as M. Thiers would apparently induce us to believe, that the Peninsular War was a war maintained by the French Empire at once against the British army and the Spanish nation. It is well known that Joseph Buonaparte commanded a larger native Spanish army than was ever led into action by the Duke of Wellington. This native force is stated by Sir W. Napier to have exceeded 40,000 men in 1812. They were the best trained and best disciplined of the Spanish troops. The Peninsular War, therefore, was no such contest against three nations, as the French writers have described it; but rather a civil war, commenced by invasion, and maintained by the innumerable legions of France against the forces of this country and of Portugal.

The same determination to look upon no other than the French side of the picture, leads M. Thiers to depreciate all the Duke of Wellington's victories, and even to misrepresent his policy and his character. Throughout the disastrous campaigns of France in the Peninsula, M. Thiers sees nothing but the false tactics of the French marshals which prevented a successful issue: yet throughout the German campaigns of Napoleon he sees nothing but the genius which triumphed over the still false tactics of the Austrian and Prussian commanders. It is thus that he tells us of the commencement of the campaign of 1812, that 'by seasonably concentrating the French disposable forces, one might have ensured the miscarriage of Lord Wellington's designs.'<sup>\*</sup> It is thus that he ascribes the loss of the battle of Salamanca to the same want of concentration on the part of Marmont, Soult, and Joseph;<sup>†</sup> and the loss of Spain at Vittoria to the absence of Foy and Clausel, 'who would have overwhelmed the English, and have driven them back into Portugal.'<sup>‡</sup> But no such solace is held out to the German enemies of France for their disasters at Ulm and Austerlitz, or at Jena and Auerstadt. It is obvious that the rapidity of action by which a general crushes in detail an unconcentrated enemy, is one of the first attributes of military genius; and that the false strategy of the astute marshals of France bore no sort of comparison with the gigantic blunders of Mack, of Alexander, of the Duke of Brunswick, and of the Archduke Charles.

Let us glance at one more of these elaborate apologies for the issue of the Peninsular War—that derived from the defects

\* Vol. xv. p. 63.

† Vol. xv. p. 107.

‡ Vol. xvi. p. 132.

of the French military administration. If it were the aim of the author to write *history*, he ought to have portrayed the difficulties which were experienced on either side. If it were his aim to write simply a political vindication, he could hardly have made a more fatal choice. For while such defects were greater upon our side than on that of the French, it is clear also that the argument, if introduced into a comparison between the Duke of Wellington and Napoleon, signally fails. In the one case it directly impeaches the administrative capacity of Buonaparte himself, while it very indirectly affects that of Wellington, who did not control the British Executive, and who notoriously struggled against administrative imperfections which he had not the power to remedy.

1. Compare, for example, the fiscal difficulties of the French at the opening of the campaign of 1812, which M. Thiers relates, with the corresponding difficulties of the British, which he does not notice :—

‘The twenty-four million francs which Napoleon had promised to devote annually to pay were not as yet discharged in 1812 for the year 1811; and on the million a month granted to Joseph, with the view of aiding him in forming an administration, two millions and a half were due for 1811, and six millions for 1812.’ (Vol. xv. p. 39.)

If we turn to the British side of this picture, we find that just as Wellington was taking the field, his Portuguese troops, still more irregularly paid, threatened open mutiny; that the Portuguese Government was clamouring for the payment of its subsidy; that a credit of half a million from the British Treasury was withheld, through an alleged informality in the certificates; and that while in this crisis the French army increased, and the Anglo-Sicilian force was diverted from Valencia to Italy, ‘two million dollars, which he hoped to have obtained at Gibraltar, had been swept off by Lord William Bentinck for this Italian expedition, which at once deprived him of men and money.’\*

2. Compare again parallel instances of disorganisation in the two armies :—

‘Of the five armies (says M. Thiers, of the same campaign) occupying Spain, that of the north openly refused to obey him (King Joseph); that of Portugal did not indeed by any means refuse, but was obedient in order to be supported; that of the Centre, placed immediately under his orders, rendered him direct and absolute obedience, but it was almost a nullity; that of Andalusia, the most numerous, the least occupied, was resolute in disobeying him, had until now ignored the authority of Joseph, and might feign to be ignorant of it for some time hence; finally, that of Arragon, though full of con-

---

\* Napier, vol. v. pp. 144–5.

sideration for Joseph, and actually rendering him aid in money, was incapable of rendering him any other.' (Vol. xv. p. 57.)

Yet this is but a faint counterpart to the disorganisation experienced by the Duke of Wellington. His parallel difficulties were of three kinds. If we turn to his letters to the Marquess of Romana, in 1814, we shall see that he could not control the Spanish forces in his own camp, although their titular generalissimo.\* If we turn to the events which compelled him to raise the siege of Burgos in 1812, we shall see that he could not so much as secure the independent co-operation of the Spanish generals in the south, which would have diverted the troops of Soult. If we turn to the conduct of the British generals in his own army, we shall find that during the retreat of 1812, they set his authority at defiance, and marched their corps by routes of their own selection, until their retreat was arrested by an impassable river.

3. Compare also M. Thiers' picture of the conflicting tactics of the French commanders during the retreat from Burgos, in 1812, with the anarchy which in the meantime subsisted in Lord Wellington's camp. The British, during this retreat, were daily murdered by their Spanish allies; and within one hour of the distribution of arms to the Spanish troops, these very troops were observed by Lord Wellington selling them under his own windows!†

4. Compare once more the difficulties of the French army arising from the want of secure communication, with the corresponding difficulties of the British. M. Thiers brings into view the continual interception of the French despatches during the campaigns of Salamanca, Vittoria, and Torres Vedras, as a difficulty which had no parallel upon our side. It is probable that the French here sustained more annoyance than ourselves; and to this, rather than to voluntary disobedience, the apparent disunion of the French generals is to be ascribed. But if Wellington could transmit his orders with less insecurity, he could rarely rely on their fulfilment. When he had prepared for the prompt transmission of his siege-train from Lisbon to Burgos, in 1812, Mr. Stuart, the British Commissioner, disembarked it at Corunna instead of Lisbon, and thereby caused the retreat into Portugal; and the Duke's policy was systematically set at defiance by the cabals of the Portuguese Regency.

Great difficulties undoubtedly existed on both sides. Such difficulties are inseparable from military operations at a distance from their efficient basis. But the true test of military superi-

---

\* Wellington Despatches, 1814.      † Napier, vol. v. p. 320.

ority is the success with which such difficulties are overcome. Our complaint against M. Thiers is that, whilst he brings prominently forward the administrative defects which lessen the humiliation of defeat, he withholds all mention of those which heighten the merit of victory.

We shall glance next at M. Thiers' criticism of the detail of our campaigns and general actions; and we select in the first instance the battle of Barossa, gained by General Graham, afterwards Lord Lynedoch, over Marshal Victor, in March, 1811. We shall deal with three definite points—(1) the numbers engaged—(2) the tactics displayed—(3) and the losses sustained on either side.

1. Here is the author's statement of the numbers of the two armies:—

‘Marshal Victor, on the morning of the fifth, did not hesitate to take the offensive with the *five thousand* men which he had under his orders. . . . He had no chance of beating *twenty thousand with five thousand*, especially since among these twenty thousand there were nine thousand English.’ (Vol. xii. pp. 635–6.)

M. Thiers offers no authority for his assertion upon either side. Now it happens that the intercepted official papers of the French Colonel Lejeune compute the French *disposable* force (which excludes the garrisons) under Victor's orders, at 9,458, seventeen days after the battle.\* The French loss in action was, as we see, 2361; the only absent detachment was that of Cassagne, 2000 strong; and no succours appear to have arrived in the interval. We must here therefore contradict M. Thiers, on the authority of French official documents, and compute the force of Victor on the heights of Barossa at nearly *ten thousand*.

The British force—independently of the Spanish—can only be inferentially computed. It appears from our own rolls that on the 25th of February—eight days before the battle—General Graham had but 4294 troops at Tarifa†; and that the force of La Pêna, the Spanish commander, mustered 12,800‡, a number which leaves but 7200 to the British, on the calculation of the aggregate force by M. Thiers himself. But the greatest blunder of this computation is that the Spanish force *did not take part in the battle of Barossa*. It was therefore gained, not by 20,000 Anglo-Spanish over 5000 French, but by a force at most probably of 7000 British over nearly 10,000 French.

\* The report of Lejeune is published in Napier, vol. iii. App. No. i. sec. 7.

† Nap. vol. iii. App. No. ii.

‡ Nap. vol. iii. p. 446.

2. In regard to the battle itself, M. Thiers mistakes the skirmish which gave occasion to it for the general action. After describing Victor as taking 'the offensive,' he says:—

'Leaving on his right General Villatte, who, in occupying the banks of the canal, drew upon himself one part of the hostile forces, he vigorously directed his own force upon the sandy heights which the Anglo-Spaniards were occupying . . . The infantry threw back the first line upon the second, but stopped on seeing three lines yet to attack; for the Anglo-Spaniards, neglecting General Villatte, were massing themselves each behind the other, and presenting four lines in parallel array.' (Vol. xii. p. 636.)

If we turn for a confutation of this extraordinary blunder to Sir W. Napier's history, we shall see that M. Thiers has exactly inverted the relations of the two armies. The only attack of the French upon these heights was directed against a feeble Spanish detachment incapable of resistance. The French, therefore, were already in possession of the heights before the battle began; and the battle of Barossa was the attack led by General Graham for their recapture. The assumption that the Spaniards co-operated with the British in this attack is singularly erroneous. La Peña, the Spanish commander, lay within sight of the action at the head of his whole force, and refused to move a single division in support of his allies.†

3. Again, M. Thiers asserts of the losses on either side:—  
'If the enemy had had about 2000 killed and wounded, we had nearly 1200.'

We find, on the contrary, that our own loss was 1200, and that the French loss, according to a French official statement certified by Count Gazan himself, was 2361.† M. Thiers does not add that we took 6 guns, 400 prisoners, and 2 generals.

We turn next to the battle of Busaco, which was fought on the occasion of Lord Wellington's famous retreat upon Torres Vedras. That Wellington delivered battle in this instance, was, according to M. Thiers, 'because he was unwilling to re-enter his lines as a fugitive.' This supposition misconceives his policy not less than his strategy. The impregnable lines of Torres Vedras were his base; and their very existence was unknown to Massena when he entered Portugal. It was the counterpart of this scheme of defence to exhaust the resources of the country in the rear of the retreating army, and thus to interpose at once an impassable barrier between the enemy and the British, and famine between the enemy and his communications. Wellington accordingly gave battle at Busaco in order

\* Nap. vol. iii. pp. 442-47.

† Nap. vol. iii. App. iv. sec. 9.



to gain time for the complete exhaustion of the territory through which either army would pass.

The following criticism evinces an entire misapprehension of the whole plan of the campaign.

'The majority of the houses had been devastated by the English, and not by the inhabitants, who had not the slightest desire to waste their property in order to starve the French. Massena, desiring to make them understand that it was but duperly on their part to follow the advice of Lord Wellington, would have wished to destroy nothing, with a view to convince them that, in preserving their towns, they preserved them for themselves much more than for the French.' (Vol. xii. p. 379.)

The campaign of Torres Vedras was marked by equal foresight in design and fortitude in execution. It is with no common bitterness of feeling that M. Thiers attempts to soften the humiliation and discomfiture of Massena. That the Portuguese people did not comprehend the schemes of Wellington is by no means improbable, when we observe that an acute historian, forty years after they were realised, is not more fortunate. It is no slur, therefore, on their patriotism, that many of them were unwilling to carry out those schemes. All, consequently, that M. Thiers proves is, that their hatred of the French did not preponderate 'over their self-love'—that their resentment was not suicidal. But it is a matter of fact that very many of the inhabitants accepted the shelter of the lines of Torres Vedras. And it is asserted by Napier, that if Wellington's designs had not been frustrated by the Portuguese Regency, a week's campaign would have starved the French army.

The inversion of the character of Wellington and Massena which is here attempted, is certainly not successful. According to M. Thiers, the British commander is the savage, and the French the humane general. The paradox is at least sustained with great simplicity. Of course Massena 'wished to destroy 'nothing;' for his existence depended on the Portuguese supplies. But how can M. Thiers criticise Wellington by the test of Massena's conduct, when it is on record that Massena, during his own retreat, wasted again the Portuguese territory, in order to destroy the supplies of Wellington?

M. Thiers applies the same criticism, in his fourteenth volume, to the system of retreat adopted by the Russians in 1812. This retreat is known to have been directly founded on the immortal experiment of Wellington at Torres Vedras. The burning of Moscow, according to this author, crowned the barbaric policy which the exhaustion of the soil by the retreating army had displayed. That which we regard as the greatest

patriotism of the Russians was, in his view, their worst brutality. Criticisms such as these are more tolerable in a splenetic general who is the dupe of hostile strategy, than in a calm historian whose only object professes to be truth. Was it more barbarous to exhaust one's own country in national defence, or to 'make war support itself' in military aggression?

It is certainly amusing to turn to the estimate of the Duke of Wellington's principles of warfare which M. Thiers has offered in his chapter on Salamanca, as though resolved to prove that, if it presented any distinctive practice, it involved at least no distinctive principle. 'The Duke' — he assures us, with a ludicrous credulity or invention — 'wrote incessantly to his Government, that if he had those admirable French soldiers, as he termed them, who dispensed with a commissariat, ran here and there to get their food, returned immediately to their colours, prepared their supper in haste with what they had procured, and fought, even though they had not the time to prepare it, he could maintain the war without money.'

M. Thiers may be compared to a guerilla chief, who carries on his operations upon the basis of a jungle penetrable only by himself. Whenever an encounter is threatened, he retreats immediately into the French archives, where he knows that there is no pursuit. Does he here intend to assert that these 'incessant communications' of the Duke of Wellington to the British Government — which, as 'the fear of alleging what is inexact fills him with confusion,' he has of course seen and read — are intercepted despatches which exist in the French archives? We point out the statement as an absurdity without caring to refute it as an assertion of fact. It evinces not simply an entire ignorance of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, but the most extravagant misconception, both of his circumstances and of his principles of warfare. His published despatches are nearly a continuous protest, not simply against the principle of pillage which he is here asserted to uphold, but against the perpetration of it in practice, which he ascribes to the want of that very commissariat which M. Thiers represents him as anxious to exchange for an army of practised marauders. His despatches to Romana, on the French (legally a hostile) territory, which announce his resolution to send back the Spanish army into Spain because they committed pillage, are a singular commentary on the assertion that he was desirous of pursuing that pillage on the Spanish, which was legally a friendly territory.

We shall next follow our author to the campaign of 1812.

This campaign may be described as one in which Lord Wel-

lington stormed two of the chief fortresses of Spain, won one general action, captured the Spanish capital, and carried his arms within forty leagues of the Pyrenees, in defiance of five French armies, each, with one exception, not less numerous than his own. The Anglo-Portuguese force under arms is computed by Sir W. Napier at 56,000, and by M. Thiers himself at not more than 60,000. The French army with the eagles is estimated by, either at 230,000 or 240,000. The Spanish forces in alliance with the Anglo-Portuguese are acknowledged to have been efficacious only in harassing the movements of the French. The armies immediately opposing Wellington on the Portuguese frontier were those of Marmont in Old Castile, and of Soult in Andalusia. The latter general is chosen by M. Thiers as the scapegoat who shall bear the whole responsibility of this campaign; and his narrative is pre-eminent for its injustice to that great commander.

By a strikingly false criticism of this campaign, M. Thiers blames the French generals on the frontier for not uniting their forces for the expulsion of Wellington from Spain; and he does not perceive that the strategy of Wellington, at the period to which he refers, was the cause which prevented their concentration. The British general, by three distinct achievements, had at once advanced his line of defence, and destroyed the communications of Soult and Marmont. Having stormed Ciudad Rodrigo to the north and Badajos to the south, and being thus master of the intervening valley of the Tagus, he blew up the bridge of Almaraz, which interrupted the direct communication between Soult and Marmont, and reconstructed the broken bridge of Alcantara, which restored the direct communication between Badajos and Ciudad Rodrigo. The two great advantages which he thus gained were the key of his whole future strategy. He equally threatened Soult and Marmont; and he moved his troops between the two vital extremities of his line over a space shorter by a fortnight's march than the French armies.

If we apply these tactics to the two positions assumed by M. Thiers we shall at once perceive the error of his criticism. He blames Soult first, for not marching in support of Marmont before the advance of Wellington on Salamanca; and secondly, for not afterwards despatching the corps of Drouet, which was watched by the corps of Hill. He contrasts the alleged penetration of Marmont in foreseeing the attack of Wellington in the north, with the alleged blunder of Soult in anticipating that attack in the south. Surely this implies simply that Wellington realised his scheme of threatening either

army. He then bitterly reviles Soult for not despatching the corps of Drouet which, he intimates, would have changed the fate of Salamanca. Now, we have already seen that the corresponding corps of Hill could have joined Wellington a fortnight sooner than that of Drouet could join Marmont. If, therefore, Soult had despatched Drouet's force, Wellington and Hill might have crushed Marmont even more effectually before Drouet could arrive.

But M. Thiers' misconception of this campaign extends to the detail of nearly every action. Compare his version of the battle of Salamanca itself with the narrative of every other credible writer. He falls into the extraordinary error of representing as casual and unintentional on either side that battle, the origin of which we hold to be the finest illustration of Wellington's distinctive genius. He terms it '*cette funeste et involontaire bataille*,' and deprecates 'the imprudence of those who had engaged in a useless action.\*' The origin of the battle is thus described:—

'It was noon: the whole work of the day would have been consumed in similar manœuvres without great loss on either side, and certainly towards night Lord Wellington would have retreated to regain Ciudad Rodrigo, restoring to us Salamanca without a contest, but that Marshal Marmont, by a fatal impatience not to fight but to manœuvre, resolved to attack the rear-guard of his adversary, whom he believed to be ready to decamp. . . . General Maucune, commanding that division of the centre which was most in advance on the left, was an officer of tried courage and of extreme boldness on the field of battle. Believing the English to be in full retreat, he imagined that the moment to attack them was arrived. He demanded consequently the order to attack; *he did not wait for it, drove before him the hostile tirailleurs, who gave way, descended into the intervening space which separated the two armies, and engaged with the English divisions of the centre, the divisions of Cole and Leith.* In this aspect of affairs Lord Wellington, who much wished to retreat, but not to fly (!), *accepted the battle which seemed to be offered him, and gave orders to his centre to receive and repel the attack of ours.*' (Pp. 94, 95.)

Now it happens that this ingenious fabrication, which involves the origin of the battle of Salamanca, is contradicted with equal circumstantiality by either Commander-in-Chief, by the despatches of Lord Wellington, and by the despatches of the Duke of Ragusa. 'The extension of his (Marmont's) line to his left,' writes Lord Wellington to Lord Bathurst, '*gave me an opportunity of attacking him, for which I had long been anxious.*'†

\* Vol. xv. pp. 99–101.

† Wellington Despatches, 1812. Desp. of 24th July.

This is the testimony of the British commander. 'Enfin,' writes Marshal Marmont to the French Minister of War, in speaking of the disorganisation of his left wing, 'à cinq heures, jugeant que la situation est favorable, l'ennemi attaque avec impétuosité cette gauche mal formée, les divisions combattant repoussent l'ennemi, en sont repoussées à leur tour.\*' This is the testimony of the French commander.

It is not less clear that the troops of Maucune, far from so much as receiving the British attack, lay inactive towards the rear. 'Meanwhile,' says Sir W. Napier, 'Bonet's troops having failed at the village of Arapiles, were sharply engaged with the fourth division; Maucune kept his menacing position behind the French Arapiles.' And again, 'Maucune's division was still in mass behind the French Arapiles, and Foy's remained untouched on the right.†

It is obvious that no higher authority than that of the Duke of Ragusa can be adduced, for two reasons. He occupied a position which commanded the whole plain; and it is precisely the Duke of Ragusa who is most interested in the fidelity of M. Thiers' statement; for that statement, which throws the burden of battle on his lieutenant (who, as we have seen, was in the rear), tends to exempt the Marshal himself from the results of his false movement.‡ It must be for M. Thiers to authenticate from the French archives what he ventures to assert in defiance of this concurrent testimony.

M. Thiers' detail of the battle is as erroneous as his conception of its origin. He tells us that the French general, Thomières, after Maucune's imaginary attack had begun, descended into the plain and encountered Picton's division of infantry on the British right. On the contrary, he was attacked by Pakenham. He tells us, again, that the attack of the British left was made by the Portuguese under Pakenham. On the contrary, Pakenham, as has been seen, was engaged on the right, and the Portuguese were commanded by Pack. What would M. Thiers say of an English writer who asserted of the battle of Austerlitz, that Soult, and not Davoust, commanded the troops at Raggern, and that Davoust, and not Soult, led the attack of the French left?

The issue of the battle, as it is here related, is still more

\* *Mémoires du Duc de Raguse*, vol. iv. p. 445. Desp. of 31st July.

† Napier, vol. v. p. 171-4.

‡ Although this volume of Marmont's *Memoirs* was not published when M. Thiers wrote the corresponding volume of his history, it is to be presumed that the French Marshal's despatch existed in the French archives.

inaccurate than the detail. 'Les Anglais ayant cessé d'insister,' is the author's view of the attitude of the victors when the battle closed. This is hardly characteristic of an action in which we took eleven guns, two eagles, six colours, and seven thousand prisoners\*, and drove an army of forty thousand men from the frontiers of Portugal to the banks of the Ebro. M. Thiers, however, throws a veil over these losses of the French. Why, moreover, if we ceased the action, and thereby declared it indecisive, should the French army have instantly recrossed the Tormes—even the Duero—in the face of an enemy who had not beaten them in the field, and who but an hour before were about to fall back themselves?

'We thus regained towards night the banks of the Tormes,' and repassed that river *without being pursued.*' (P. 99.)

The author here implies that the French retreated leisurely and unmolested, after a battle ended by daylight. Night, on the contrary, closed an action followed by pursuit. 'It was dark,' writes the victor of Salamanca, 'before this point was carried by the sixth division; and the enemy fled through the woods towards the Tormes. *I pursued them . . . . . We renewed the pursuit at break of day in the morning.*' And in reply to the assertion, that the loss on either side involved 5000 or 6000 men, we have shown that the French loss exceeded that number in prisoners alone. The 'Battle of Salamanca,' then, by M. Thiers, is a historic fiction—it is a myth in its origin, in its detail, and in its result.

The political and military criticism of the Duke of Wellington's subsequent movement on Madrid is not more felicitous. We are told (as has been already hinted) that the Duke turned from the pursuit of Marmont in order to make a triumphal entry into the Spanish capital! Wellington 'concealed under a calm reserve *une vanité peu ordinaire.*' 'To make a triumphal entry into Madrid had with him an irresistible attraction.' He was '*enorgueilli*' by his triumph. No Englishman will need the refutation which is here offered in the last lines of Napier's chapter on Salamanca, — 'I saw him late in the evening of that great day, when the advancing flashes of cannon and musketry, stretching as far as the eye could command, showed in the darkness how well the field was won: he was alone—the flush of victory was on his brow—his eyes were eager and watchful, but his voice was calm, and even gentle. More than the rival of Marlborough, since he had defeated greater warriors than Marlborough ever

---

\* Earl of Wellington's despatch to Earl Bathurst, 24th July, 1812.  
VOL. CVII. NO. CCXVIII.

‘encountered, with a prescient pride he seemed only to accept this glory as an earnest of better things.’

M. Thiers' criticism is offered at the expense of incessant self-contradiction. He tells us, where he is depreciating the march on Madrid, that if Wellington had ‘pursued the army of Portugal without intermission, in its condition of fatigue, of irritation, of moral revolt, it is doubtful whether General Clausel, in spite of his *aplomb* and his vigour, could have preserved it from total destruction.’\* Yet he has told us, where he is depreciating the battle of Salamanca, that ‘thanks to him (Clausel) the army did not cease to represent an *ensemble* which Lord Wellington, in his commendable prudence, was unwilling to attempt to attack anew.’† He tells us that ‘although the situation (of the two armies after Salamanca) were deeply changed, the difference in material results was not considerable;’‡ and that Clausel's army had been ‘rallied, re-organised, and re-animated.’§ Yet he tells us, where he is depreciating the difficulties which obliged Wellington to raise the siege of Burgos, that Clausel ‘had but the *débris* of an army recently defeated.’|| He tells us that the French lost but 5000 or 6000 by Salamanca¶, out of an army which he fixes at 42,000.\*\* Yet he tells us that Clausel, when free from pursuit, and among French garrisons on the north of the Duero, could only rally 25,000 men.††

It requires no strategic knowledge to perceive that if Wellington had pursued Clausel beyond the Duero, he would have surrendered his whole communications to the army of King Joseph, which was advancing from Madrid to support the army defeated at Salamanca. He turned therefore on the advancing force,—his motives are on record ††—either to crush it unsupported, or in any case to rouse Spanish enthusiasm, and destroy French organisation, by the capture of Madrid. Marmont's army, now commanded by Clausel (whom Wellington, till he had defeated Joseph, could not follow beyond Valladolid), had fallen back on Burgos, unable to take the field. Madrid therefore was the only achievement of the hour; the movement was just and brilliant; with 50,000 men in the heart of 200,000 enemies, Wellington would yet probably have beaten one by one the unconcentrated French armies if his siege-train had not been landed at Corunna against his orders, and the Spanish generals had not deliberately permitted Soult to raise the siege of Cadiz. The capture of Madrid was therefore the *coup* at once

\* Vol. xv. p. 109.

† Vol. xv. p. 102.

‡ P. 100.

§ P. 133.

|| P. 134.

¶ P. 100.

\*\* P. 88.

†† P. 133.

†† Despatch to Earl Bathurst, Aug. 13th, 1812.

of the strategist and of the politician.\* It may be added that the British army were at that time wholly unprepared with the supplies and transports required for a march into the northern provinces of Spain, in pursuit of a still formidable enemy.

We will notice one more Peninsular campaign. It shall be that of Vittoria.

M. Thiers has here hit upon a new hypothesis to depreciate our victories. His old theory of indecisive actions was obviously untenable as applied to a campaign which destroyed the French power in three weeks. The numerical superiority of the British is accordingly the consolatory paradox which is here set up.

The campaign of Vittoria in 1813 was opened by Wellington with 90,000 troops, composed of three inharmonious nations, against 150,000 almost entirely French. By the plan of Napoleon, the French armies were as available to act against Wellington as Wellington's army was available to act against them. Napoleon, says M. Thiers himself, 'prescribes the evacuation of Madrid, the concentration of the French forces in Old Castile; but orders the army of Portugal to be lent to General Clausel to destroy the bands of the north before the opening of the campaign.'† 'It was necessary,' writes the author, in defence of this strategy, 'to fight beyond the Pyrenees in order not to be obliged to fight on this side of them.'‡ The French armies, in a word, were to be concentrated on the Duero, that they might not be attacked on the Bidassoa; and the Spanish monarchy of Joseph Buonaparte vanished into a French *propugnaculum imperii*. It is clear, therefore, that nearly the whole French army was available for concentration on the Duero, and that the destruction even of the guerilla bands in the north was to be held subordinate to the repulse of Wellington.

M. Thiers maintains that, on the opening of this campaign, during the last days of May, the French army, which defended

---

\* As M. Thiers alludes with great satisfaction to the capture of three British guns in a reconnaissance near Madrid, it should be added that these guns, which were taken in consequence of their having been *overturned*, were *recaptured*. It may be worth while, in the opinion of one who speaks in such terms of the temporary capture of three overturned guns, to supply another deficiency in this narrative, by adding that the Duke of Wellington captured, as the result of his criticised march upon Madrid, not less than 200 guns, and 20,000 stand of arms. (*Despatch to General Clinton, Aug. 14.*)

† Thiers, vol. xvi. p. 92.

‡ P. 91.



the lines of the Ducro, had three courses to pursue. They might give battle with 52,000 against 90,000; they might manœuvre on their lines; they might retire at once on Burgos and Vittoria. The former was impracticable, as the author acknowledges, since the French had not concentrated one half of their disposable force. The assumption of the second course does not take into account that the French army was surprised, in a manner which rendered precipitate retreat the only alternative to escape destruction.

If the author had turned to the '*Mémoires du Roi Joseph*,' he would have seen that the King had not the faintest knowledge of the movements of Wellington down almost to the very moment when the campaign opened in overwhelming force. The King's letter of the 20th of May, to the French Minister of War, simply speculates on the contingency of an invasion, and views it as a remote event. His letter of the 27th first intimates his knowledge of the British movements. Orders were then issued, though too late, for the concentration of the French. Yet in that interval Wellington had veiled a forced march of 40,000 men in cavalry, infantry, and artillery, led by Graham, through Tras Los Montes — a district, Napier writes, which had been held 'impracticable for small corps' — and placed them on the Esla, where they turned the flank of the French lines before the enemy had known of their approach.

The passage of Tras Los Montes was not less brilliant than the passage of the Fort de Bard, and the surprise of the French on the Esla was equal to the surprise of the Austrians in the Vale of Aosta. The first collision of the hostile armies to the south of the Duero occurred on the very day upon which Joseph, for the first time, appears to have heard of the British movements: Two days afterwards (on the 29th) Wellington crossed the Duero in a basket slung by a rope stretching from rock to rock several hundred feet above the torrent. On the 1st of June Graham passed the Esla, three days too late, as Napier laments, for the destruction of the French army, which Wellington had planned by the combined action of all arms on the 29th of May. It is clear, then, that the French army was surprised, as perhaps no French army was surprised before; that on the 1st of June they were at once turned in flank, and attacked in front; and that their retreat was so precipitate that they fought a decisive battle within twenty days, at a distance of nearly 200 miles from their fortified lines.

• Vittoria itself is scarcely described with more accuracy than

Salamanca. M. Thiers insists that the French had but 52,000 on the field, and the English and their allies 90,000. Now, the French muster-roll was lost in the action, and it is impossible for M. Thiers to do more than to approximate to the French numbers. Those numbers are computed by Napier at about 70,000. Wellington, it appears, from the same authority, had not more than 60,000 Anglo-Portuguese, and 20,000 Spaniards of doubtful efficiency. Either of these computations includes artillery. Wellington brought into the battle only 90 guns, and captured after the battle 151.\* It is probable therefore that the strength of the two armies was not appreciably dissimilar. M. Thiers tells us that the charges of the British cavalry routed the French army as they were beginning to retreat. It happens that the *absence* of these cavalry charges forms Napier's sole criticism on the Duke of Wellington's command in this action.

Many other details of the British movements equally differ from the details given by their eye-witness and chief historian. In the selection of passages for investigation we have of course chosen those which chiefly affect the honour of the British arms, and on which we possess the fullest and most authentic materials. The result of our comparison is unfavourable enough to the accuracy of the military details on which M. Thiers mainly affects to rest his historical reputation. The Peninsular War is, however, a subject which he treats with evident, and not unnatural distaste, and he seeks to throw into the shade the events in which Great Britain bore so conspicuous a part, by drawing the attention of the reader to the contemporary events in which the star of Napoleon still beamed with undiminished lustre.

We here pause for the present; but we propose to resume in our next Number our survey of some of the leading passages of this eventful history. In dealing with a work which extends to seventeen large octavo volumes, and which is literally the produce of the labour of a life, we are unavoidably compelled to pass over in silence much that commands our admiration, as well as much that provokes our dissent. On the present occasion we have selected for the objects of criticism those chapters in which

---

\* It is due to M. Thiers to acknowledge that he here over-estimates the French force in artillery. He computes the number of French guns lost in action at 200. We have compared the Duke of Wellington's despatch, stating the number of guns captured to be 151, with his verbal statement to the late Earl of Ellesmere, that he captured the whole French artillery. (*Wellington Despatches*, and *Lord Ellesmere's Memoir*.)

M. Thiers appears to us to have done injustice to the policy of the British Cabinet, and the military operations of the British forces. But before we take our final leave of this history, we shall endeavour to investigate the effects of the imperial system on the internal condition of France, and to follow M. Thiers through some of the later campaigns of the Emperor Napoleon.

ART. IV. — *The Life of George Stephenson, Railway Engineer.*  
By SAMUEL SMILES. 3rd edition. London: 1857.

THE history of mechanical inventions is seldom quite clear and complete: the biographies of the men who have devoted their genius and their energy to these pursuits are seldom entirely satisfactory. Scarcely any one of the inventions, which have most powerfully affected the condition of the human race, can fairly be attributed to the powers of any single mind. In most instances a series of imperfect experiments has prepared the way for the fortunate discoverer, whom some casual occurrence or some flash of genius may at last have placed within reach of honours and emoluments, which his meritorious predecessors failed to earn; and a strictly equitable judgment must pause ere it awards the prize which so many successive competitors have contributed to win. But to this observation the life of George Stephenson, and the great invention of the locomotive engine, which forms the basis of modern railway transport, form a striking exception. Sprung from the humblest ranks of the colliers of Northumberland, trained in the hard and mechanical duties of a coal-pit — unblest by the light of education, unacquainted with the proud discoveries of science, unassisted save by the friends he earned by his own integrity, ability, and talent, — opposed by a formidable array of adverse circumstances, and by prejudices and interests more formidable still, — George Stephenson owed every inch of his progress to himself; he acquired by painful labour and hard-earned experience everything he knew, everything he did, everything he possessed; and the volume before us exhibits to the reader a picture of courageous perseverance which entitles him to the admiration of his countrymen and the world, as much as those prodigious results of ingenuity and calculation which are identified with his name.

We know few books in the English language, we can point to few lives of English worthies, more honourable to the people

among whom such men are born. The career of George Stephenson, like that of Lord Collingwood, in another profession but in a kindred spirit, furnishes a memorable and beneficial example of the highest fame, not acquired by dashing exploits or by any sudden inspiration, but by stout-hearted faith and endurance, by the careful improvement of time, and by the maxim that patience is the truest genius. Such qualities are independent of the gifts of fortune, and the men who combine them with the highest order of intellect deserve to stand above the favourites of fortune. They are a lesson to the world; and if the biography of the heroic ages has inspired many a gallant deed of enterprise and valour, the biography of George Stephenson is not less calculated to encourage, and to inform the character and the efforts of many an English artisan who may aspire by the same means to similar success.

● Mr. Smiles has seized with excellent taste and feeling the high moral tone of his subject. His work is perfectly unaffected, unpretending, and true. He appears to have felt that his task was to draw an honest picture of an honest man; and he has heightened the charm of the narrative by touches of natural feeling and simple worth, to which George Stephenson was no stranger. The interest of the story gains on us step by step as we advance from the gin at Mid-Mill and the pit at Black Callerton, to his establishment as engine-wright at Killingworth, — where his first locomotive engine was made, — thence by a gradual series of progressive inventions to the first lines of railway, to the construction of his ‘Rocket,’ which bore away the prize on the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railroad, and finally to the prodigious development of the railway system throughout this kingdom and all the civilised countries in the world. In all these events it may, without exaggeration, be said that George Stephenson was not only the first and the most prominent, but often the sole actor. In his early conviction of the speed his engine was destined to accomplish, in his invariable preference for the locomotive over the fixed engine, and in his far-sighted conception of the change this invention would produce in all existing modes of communication and transport, he stood alone. Even his supporters and friends were alarmed at the magnitude of his anticipations, and entreated him to be more moderate in his promises, if he wished to be thought trustworthy and sane. Little gifted with facility of speech or ingenuity of argument, it was more easy for George Stephenson to perform and to exceed his own surprising predictions, than to persuade other men of their feasibility. Barely thirty years have elapsed since

this revolution in the mechanism of social intercourse began. Those amongst us who have reached the middle age can remember every step of its progress; but living as we now do in the midst of the results which daily experience has rendered so familiar to us, it is scarcely possible even for ourselves to recall the prodigious amount of incredulity, of apprehension, of scientific absurdity, of legal chicanery, of sturdy prejudice, which were arrayed against the most important improvement the world has beheld since the invention of printing. In front of all these antagonists George Stephenson stood erect, collected, and undismayed. He relied on no arts and no influence but those which he had acquired from perseverance and experience. His judgment was so correct and his eye so sure, that he seems by intuition to have discovered the right path, where everything about him was hesitation and perplexity. But when once the impulse had been given by his genius, he found a nation of unbounded wealth and enterprise ready and eager to follow his lead. Although he had passed the meridian of life before the first locomotive ran on the first railway, yet he lived long enough to see thousands of miles of railway executed or in progress; to see hundreds of millions expended on the creation of these iron tracks bearing along their fiery messengers; to direct the execution of works far exceeding in magnitude the greatest operations of human labour; and to verify his own prediction that locomotive railways would become the highways of the world.

It is not our intention on the present occasion to follow in detail the interesting narrative of these changes which Mr. Smiles has given us. The *'Life of George Stephenson'* has already been widely circulated—it deserves to be read universally,—and no succinct review of it can do justice to its merits. But the subject itself is in continual and rapid progress. The results and the development of the railway system are still imperfectly known and incomplete. Every month adds something to the knowledge derived from experience in the management of these vast concerns. In addition to their mechanical requirements and their social effects, railroads have become one of the first commercial interests of the country: their annual revenue is that of a kingdom; their capital may be estimated at nearly half the National Debt. Supply and demand, property and labour, have become in a great measure dependent on this amazing instrument; and there is no class of the community which is not more or less interested in their prosperity. We therefore propose to devote some pages to the consideration of the present state of the Rail-

ways of Great Britain; and we hope to be able to bring to this discussion some materials which have not yet been communicated to the public.

At the present time nearly 9000 miles of railway have been completed in the British Isles, and it may be assumed that about 21,000 miles are open for traffic in the rest of Europe, and 25,000 in America.

Some idea of the relative accommodation afforded by railways to the population of different countries is afforded by dividing the amount of money expended on railways in each country by the number of its inhabitants. Thus in 1855 the money expended per inhabitant amounted to

194	shillings in Great Britain.	
33	„	Prussia.
36	„	France.
43	„	Belgium.
8	„	Austria.
25	„	Germany.

At the beginning of the present year the money expended upon railways in Great Britain and Ireland amounted probably to 313,000,000*l*.

Mr. Robert Stephenson, in his Address delivered to the Institution of Civil Engineers in January, 1856, which is appended to this volume, observes —

‘ Our tunnels have traversed hills and penetrated beneath mountains to the extent of nearly seventy miles. Of our viaducts I am not at present able to give the precise extent, but some estimate may be formed from the fact of there being in London, and the suburbs, nearly eleven miles of viaduct passing through the streets. Of railway bridges there must have been built at least 25,000; far more than all the bridges ever previously known in England.’

‘ Taking at an average 70,000 cubic yards to a mile, the earthworks will measure 550,000,000 cubic yards. What does this represent? We are accustomed to regard St. Paul’s as a test for height and space; but by the side of the pyramid of earth these works would rear, St. Paul’s would be but as a pigmy by a giant. Imagine a mountain half a mile in diameter at its base, and soaring into the clouds one mile and a half in height; that would be the size of the mountain of earth which these earthworks would form.

‘ The accomplishment of these vast works has largely developed our knowledge of the principles of construction, and has led to the thorough investigation of the strength of materials.’

‘ The large amount of machinery which the railway system required has given a great impulse to mechanical engineering.

‘ It is computed that no less than 80,000,000 miles are annually traversed on our railways. Now, to run 80,000,000 miles per annum,

$2\frac{1}{2}$  miles of railway, at least, must be covered by trains, during every second of time, throughout the entire year.

¶ To work our railways even to their present extent, there must be at least 5000 locomotive engines; and supposing an engine with its tender to measure only 35 feet, it will be seen that the whole number required to work our railway system would extend in one straight line over 30 miles, or the whole distance from London to Chatham. But these are only engines and tenders. The number of vehicles of every sort employed cannot be much less than 150,000. Taking the length of each vehicle at 20 feet, you will find that could 150,000 be linked together in one train they would reach from London to Aberdeen, or a distance of 500 miles.

This rapid adoption of an entirely new system of locomotion which upset prejudices, destroyed vested interests, and has literally changed the whole face of society, was due principally to the fact, that the trade of the country had in many places reached the utmost expansion of which it was capable with ordinary roads and canals. Traction on ordinary roads was expensive; and canals, which would only accommodate a limited traffic, were liable to the obstructions of drought in summer and of ice in winter. The railway, on the other hand, could accommodate a comparatively unlimited traffic with greater certainty, greater speed, and at a low rate.

If we look upon roads, railways, and canals, with the vehicles and boats upon them, as machines for transport, a railway with the locomotive is the most perfect machine contrived to perform a similar duty. But the cost of a machine is in proportion to its excellence, and unless the amount of traffic anticipated be sufficient to cover the working expenses of the line, the construction of a railway can hardly be said to be advantageous to the community in which it is placed, though it may be useful to local interests. When high speeds are not required, a railway sufficient for all purposes of locomotion or of intercourse may be constructed and maintained more cheaply than a good ordinary road — and hence a railway will be found to be the best arterial means of communication in a new country. Thus in the Western States of the United States of America, the tracks of the emigrants have been succeeded by railways, which form the principal links between many of the towns; and even river navigation has been to a great extent superseded by railways, because they are free from the uncertainties which attend navigation in summer and winter.

A railway will not, however, prove remunerative unless a certain amount of traffic passes over it, and unless that traffic be conveyed in trains of a certain size. Hence in this mode of conveyance the desires of the few must give way to the claims

of the multitude. Railway travelling is, however, so far more comfortable and speedy than any other existing system of locomotion, that where railways exist all classes are, as it were, compelled to resort to them; the same locomotive whirls along the same rail the duchess and the bag-man, the fugitive and his pursuer, the man of business who lives by saving time, and the man of fashion who lives by killing it. The ease of railway travelling has enormously augmented the facilities of travel through our own and foreign countries; and this freedom of intercourse has already removed a thousand prejudices, and contributed to the maintenance of those friendly relations which are the best security of mutual advantage, of common knowledge, and of general peace. These indirect results of railway communication on modern society both in Europe and America are incalculably great. They form an essential part of that remarkable power which enables man in the nineteenth century to triumph over space and time; and it is one of the imperishable glories of this country, and the peculiar honour of George Stephenson, that this mighty agent of civilisation was created by his genius within the territory of Great Britain.

In addition to the indirect benefit due to railway communication by diffusing knowledge and intelligence, it directly increases capital, by cheapening conveyance, and hence leads to increased production. Thus there are parts of Wiltshire, for instance, where, before the railway was opened (two years ago), the amount of artificial manure sent into the district scarcely exceeded 150 tons per annum; the quantity now sent amounts to between 3000 and 4000 tons per annum. So with coal, the introduction of railways in many districts has been the means of reducing the price of coal from 36s. and 40s. per ton to 22s. per ton, and thus, besides the direct saving of money effected by the cheaper mode of conveyance, the reduction in price enables the farmer and the artisan to save labour by an extended application of steam power. In the cattle trade, the farmers from Aberdeen and Devonshire send up their cattle by railway, either direct to the market in London or for previous fattening in the rich pastures of Lincolnshire and Somersetshire. Gardeners from the west of England send their early fruits to Covent Garden; and Somersetshire, Dorsetshire, and Lincolnshire supply butter and milk for the London market. The railways have also largely increased the fish trade.

‘Before railways existed, the inland counties of England were unsupplied with fish from the coast. Now fresh sea fish enters into the consumption of almost every family of the middle class in every considerable town. In the fish trade indeed railways have caused



and are causing a prodigious revolution. Large fishing establishments have been formed on different parts of the east coast. Before the Norfolk railway was constructed, the conveyance of fish from Yarmouth to London was entirely conducted in light vans with post horses, and was represented by a bulk of about 2000 tons a year. At present 2000 tons of fish are not unfrequently carried on the Norfolk railway not in a year but in a fortnight.' (*R. Stephenson's Address.*)

The effects of the railway on the development of national industry are not less extraordinary.

'Look at the boiler plate manufacture, comparatively insignificant before iron vessels and steam locomotives came into existence, and now one of the most important elements of the trade to which it appertains. Such is the extent of this branch of manufacture, that, extensive as they are, the iron works are not even yet able to render the supply equal to the demand.' (*R. Stephenson's Address.*)

Ironstone is brought from Cumberland, from Wales, and from Northamptonshire, to feed the forges of Staffordshire. If railways did not exist this supply would be as impossible as the removal of the iron produced. The railway also sets free a large amount of capital, by rendering it unnecessary for small dealers in the country to hold large stocks of goods. Railway travelling also effects an important saving of time to the whole community. Mr. Robert Stephenson says:—

'Again, "Time is money." At least 111,000,000 passengers travel every year by our railways, an average of 12 miles each. They perform the journey in half an hour. At the average rate of speed of the stage coach, a journey of 12 miles would have occupied an hour and a half. Here is a direct saving of one hour upon every average journey performed by 111,000,000 of persons annually. These 111,000,000 hours saved are equal to 14,000,000 days, or 38,000 years, in the life of a working man, supposing him to work eight hours a day; and allowing at the rate of 3s. a day for his labour, the annual saving to the nation, on this low average scale, is not less than 2,000,000*l.* per annum.'

The excursion trains, which enable the artisan to leave a crowded city on a Sunday to refresh his mind and body by breathing the pure air of heaven, are most important elements in the moral as well as the physical improvement of the working classes.

It appears from the published returns of traffic upon railways for the year 1856, that 129,315,196 persons travelled 1,822,049,476 miles, and paid nearly 11,000,000*l.* in fares; that 10,450,625 cattle, sheep, and pigs were conveyed at an expense to the senders of 517,786*l.*; 23,823,930 tons of merchandise were conveyed and charged 7,685,379*l.* for conveyance;

and that 40,938,675 tons of minerals were carried for 3,585,991*l*. The total receipts on railways for the year 1856 amounted to 23,165,493*l*.

In order to carry on this large trade the total number of persons employed on railways on the 30th of June 1857 amounted to 110,000 persons. We have heard it observed by more than one country clergyman that the fact of railway companies requiring their servants to read and write has been a great stimulus in many parishes to agricultural labourers to attend classes on winter evenings. In addition to the large number of servants employed on railways, Mr. R. Stephenson estimates that 50,000 men are engaged collaterally in the preparation of iron, timber, stone, buildings, &c. ; and that, with their families, those that are dependent upon railways represent therefore 1 in 50 of the population.

The railway interest, thus powerful in number, possesses a complete organisation, and is largely and influentially represented in the Legislature. It is prepared at any moment to oppose any legislative interference with its rights or its interests. It constitutes an *imperium in imperio* ; but whilst the whole is thus powerful, the parts are in many cases adverse to each other. The governing body is composed of men of wealth and position, whose interests are often identical with those of the public. Therefore, while the railway interest is powerful to repel attacks upon its privileges, it is at the same time powerless to remove what it considers to be grievances.

Railways have thus contributed to increase the wealth of the country by economising time, by cheapening conveyance, and by enabling branches of industry to be pursued, which, without them, would have been impossible. They have, moreover, contributed directly to improve the value of property in every town and agricultural district through which they have passed. But in effecting these improvements the promoters of railways were met with opposition, and were compelled to submit to restrictions, instead of being hailed as benefactors. 'Every man's hand was against them.' One of the most curious, and we might almost say incredible, portions of the life of George Stephenson (if the facts had not occurred within our own memory) is the total want of discernment when this prodigious change first began to make itself felt by society, the violent opposition of landowners, the perplexity of the Legislature, the jibes of the Bar, the contradictions of men of science, the mixture of incredulity and ill-will, through which the serene energy of the great inventor had to plough its course, conscious of the magnitude of his designs and of the certainty of his ultimate

success.. The promoters of railways in this country have also had the disadvantage of being experimenters in a new science. They have had to discover the true principles of that science; the benefit of their experience has been reaped by foreign countries, and that experience has been necessarily acquired at an enormous cost.\*

Let us now inquire what reward the promoters of railways have received for the benefits which they have thus conferred upon the country. The whole amount of money expended upon railways at the end of 1856 was 308,775,000*l.* This expenditure, which has been of immense benefit to the nation, is equal to more than one-third of the whole amount of the national debt; but it is not much more than double what was spent in two years and a half upon the Russian war. Of this 308,775,000*l.*, 231,416,000*l.* had been raised by shares, and 77,359,000*l.* had been borrowed. The cost per mile of all railways in Great Britain and Ireland has averaged 40,288*l.* in England, 27,750*l.* in Scotland, and 14,808*l.* in Ireland. On the other hand, the more recently constructed railways have only averaged 12,273*l.* per mile in England, 5,408*l.* in Scotland, and 6,716*l.* in Ireland. The total receipts in 1856 amounted to 23,165,000*l.*, of which 10,887,000*l.* was absorbed in working expenses, and 3,607,000*l.* in payment of interest upon the borrowed money. The remainder affords a return of 3·72 per cent. upon the whole share capital invested. But of this share capital 57,057,000*l.* is preferential capital, the interest upon which averages 5·65 per cent.; therefore the average interest upon ordinary share capital is 3·12 per cent. The average interest on the English railways being 3·5 per cent., on the Scotch 2·7 per cent., and on the Irish 4 per cent. Such a return upon the capital invested in railways cannot be considered a fair remuneration to the promoters, because it is not like money on mortgage or in the funds, where the interest is certain and paid regularly; but this is money earned by close and careful management, and upon a property subject to deterioration.

---

\* It will be sufficient to instance, as an evidence of the cost of experience, a few facts with reference to the *use* of permanent way. The London and Birmingham Railway Company laid their rails at an enormous expense on stone blocks, which being found too rigid were obliged to be all removed. Similarly the Great Western Company laid their line upon longitudinal bearers supported at intervals on piles; these piles were fixed at great expense, but were also subsequently obliged to be removed, because they occasioned a series of unyielding points on an otherwise somewhat flexible road.

In other countries, it will be seen from the table which we subjoin in a note,\* that whilst the cost of construction has been less, the receipts have afforded a better return upon the capital invested.

It is thus clear that railway property in this country has not proved remunerative to the promoters of railways, notwithstanding the value which railways have been to the nation, and to the world at large. The principal cause of the unremunerative character of English lines is the large amount of money spent upon them, which has been in part due to two causes independent of the railway companies, (*viz.*) 1st. Parliamentary legislation; and, 2ndly, the exorbitant prices for land and compensation levied upon them by landowners, although the landowners are the persons whose property has been improved by the railways to a greater extent probably than the property of any other class.

The Railway Interest published last spring in the 'Railway Times,' a memorial to the Board of Trade, which purported to detail the existing grievances.

These were as follows:—

1. The tendency of Parliament to concede competing or otherwise unnecessary lines of railway.
2. The continued infliction of the passenger tax.
3. The inequitable manner in which railway companies are assessed to the poor rate.
4. The infringement upon the lawful income of railways by the Post Office in carrying parcels.
5. The partial and oppressive manner in which Lord Campbell's Act operates in cases of accident.

We propose to examine briefly the nature and extent of each of these grievances. In the first place, the memorial states:—

		Cost per mile	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Net Receipts.	Proportion per cent. of net receipts to total capital expended.
		£	£	£	£	
1856	Great Britain	35,459	23,165,000	10,887,000	12,278,000	3.97
1855	Germany	14,529	4,207,116	4,846,744	4,360,372	5.05
1855	Austria	21,387	1,901,045	1,023,918	877,127	6.29
1856	Prussia	14,101	4,537,602	2,341,005	2,196,597	6.22
1854	France	25,668	8,077,846	3,483,642	4,594,204	6.14
1856	United States	8,000	18,096,394	10,148,413	8,847,981	5.46

‘It is not our desire that the railway system should be legislatively restricted within its present limits, or that existing shareholders should, by any process whatever, be nominally or practically gifted with a monopoly of the means of railway transit. We should submit to the introduction of new lines of railway wherever called for by absolute necessity, that necessity being evidenced by *bonâ fide* subscriptions from the locality represented as desiring additional accommodation. In such cases, however, we consider that the Legislature would only be doing justice to its previous enactments in giving former applicants time to complete their engagements, so that they might be able at the proper time to exhibit their ability and their willingness to consider the wants of the public as well as their own proper remuneration.’

“The question of competition was very fully discussed in Mr. Cardwell’s Committee in 1853; and it was then laid down that no general rules could be framed for the guidance of Parliamentary Committees, but that each case must rest on its own special merits, and hence that the decision must be left to the Committees on the Bills. Since the sitting of that Committee the decisions of Parliamentary Committees have been more uniform than they previously were; but until some fixed principle shall have been laid down upon which the decisions are to be based, railway companies must feel that the value of their property is uncertain, as they will undoubtedly be liable, in many parts of the country, for several years to come, to invasions of their territory by projects for new lines, which must alter the existing relations of traffic.

In speaking of this question, Mr. R. Stephenson says:—

‘If, instead of leaving the decision of these subjects to inexperienced tribunals, a mixed commission could be organised, of practical men, of acknowledged legal, commercial, and mechanical ability, there might be hope for us. What we want is a tribunal upon these subjects, competent to judge, and willing to devote its attention to railway subjects only. We do not impute to Parliament that it is dishonest; but we impute that it is incompetent. Neither its practical experience, nor its time, nor its system of procedure, are adapted for railway legislation. Both Houses, indeed, admit their incompetency, by referring the consideration of every question to select committees. But go into a select committee, and observe how it is composed. Observe the list of subjects committed to it for investigation—including as it does, not only railway bills, but gas bills, water bills, canal bills, navigation bills, drainage bills, and burial bills. It is most unnatural to suppose that such tribunals can be satisfactory to those who have embarked hundreds of millions of money in the greatest enterprises of the age.

‘What we ask is, knowledge. Give us, we say, a tribunal competent to form a sound opinion. Commit to that tribunal, with any restrictions you think necessary, the whole of the great questions

appertaining to our system. Let it protect private interests apart from railways: let it judge of the desirability of initiatory measures, of all proposals for purchases, amalgamations, or other railway arrangements; delegate to it the power of enforcing such regulations and restrictions as may be thought needful, to secure the rights of private persons, or of the public; devolve on it the duty of consolidating, if possible, the railway laws, and of making such amendments therein, as the public interests, and the property now depending upon the system, may require; give it full delegated authority over us in any way you please: all we ask is, that it shall be a tribunal that is impartial, and that is thoroughly informed; and if impartiality and intelligence are secured, we do not fear for the result.' .

We have made this full quotation from Mr. R. Stephenson's address, in order to show what must be assumed to be the feeling of the 'railway interest' on this subject; but we must at the same time observe that, although Mr. R. Stephenson is a Member of Parliament, and must be thoroughly conversant with the proceedings in cases of Railway Bills, he has not done justice to the proceedings of Committees of the House of Commons.

We have already shown, that since 1853 the appointment of a General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills has introduced some system into the proceedings of the House, at least with respect to these Bills; and the Committee of Selection has exercised with great care and judgment the duty imposed upon it, of choosing this Committee, from which the chairmen of the Committees on Groups are appointed; and although the want of technical and special knowledge in the members of the Committees may be a subject for regret, yet how could the adjudication of these questions be given to members who possess the knowledge, when those members are mixed up, either as friends or antagonists, in the very speculations upon which the adjudication is required? At the same time there is not one constant tribunal by whom uniform principles can be laid down and adhered to; but each set of bills, in each year, is adjudicated upon by a different committee; and questions of principle have to run the gauntlet of two distinct tribunals, each appointed only for the special occasion,—one in the House of Commons, the other in the House of Lords,—which are both all-powerful to reject or accept unconditionally the actual scheme submitted, but powerless to adopt a middle course, although it might be more advisable.

The radical error of the Houses of Parliament in reference to private bill legislation is, that instead of laying down clearly-defined principles, that is to say, a general law, to guide a tribu-

nal in its adjudication upon the detailed schemes brought before it, they undertake themselves to hear and adjudicate upon the detailed cases.

The principal form which the extension of railway communication takes at the present time is that of the construction of cheap local lines; and it is both for the interest of the public, as well as for that of the railway companies, that every facility should be afforded to their development. We are inclined to think that at least for lines of this description, intended not to interfere with the rights of existing companies, but to form feeders to them, it would be advantageous to constitute a tribunal to act under a general law, somewhat similar to the General Railroad Boards in the United States of America. Such a tribunal would enable the promoters to obtain the necessary powers for acquiring land, and for crossing roads, &c.; and it might also have power, under defined conditions, of approving of working arrangements between companies. It would of course be necessary that the exercise of all authority by such a tribunal should be subject to revision by Parliament. The decisions of a tribunal so constituted would at least be uniform, whereas the decisions by Parliamentary Committees are almost necessarily as uncertain as if drawn from a lottery.

In considering the history of railway legislation, it is indeed impossible to look back, without humiliation and dismay, at the conduct of Parliament, and, we must add, of many of the statesmen who ought to have guided the decisions of Parliament on those questions. No general principle has ever been consistently adhered to. No general plan or system embracing the railway communications of Great Britain was ever conceived. Everything has been done piecemeal; every scheme has been alternately opposed by factious or rival interests, and promoted by petty and personal interests. Enormous sums have been wasted in these disputes. Sums not less enormous have been extracted from the pockets of shareholders and the public for wild and worthless purposes. And all this has occurred because (chiefly under the administration of Sir Robert Peel) no resolute attempt was made by the Government to assert some principle of authority, and to rescue railway speculation from the anarchy into which it had been allowed to fall.

The whole blame of this speculation does not, however, rest on the Legislature; and we cannot admit that the ordinary laws which regulate demand and supply were not applicable to railways, had not the operation of these laws been interrupted by disturbing elements. We endeavoured to show, on a former

occasion\*, that the high preliminary and parliamentary expenses which legislation in this country necessitates, make it the interest of lawyers, engineers, and parliamentary agents to get up schemes merely for the sake of the parliamentary campaign, and as a means of livelihood for themselves; and that the cost of passing an Act of Parliament makes those who have obtained one think that they have obtained something which must eventually prove valuable, and which they, therefore, do not like to allow to expire.

2. The second point in the grievances of the railway companies is that of passenger duty. The tax of five per cent. upon the receipts from passengers amounts to about eight per cent. of the net receipts from passengers, as it may be assumed that the cost of a passenger train averages from thirty to forty per cent. of the receipts; but the duty is remitted on parliamentary trains, and also on a large number of excursion trains. The amount of revenue derived from this source has been estimated to be about 300,000*l.* This tax is a relic of the days of stage coaches; even steam-boats are exempt from it. It presses heavily on the ordinary shareholders where dividends are small. And in these days, when travelling is no longer the luxury of the few, but is essential to the conduct of many classes of business, there does not appear to be more reason for taxing passengers than for taxing the transport of cattle or merchandise.

3. In the third place, the very heavy amount of rates which railway companies are often compelled to pay on parochial assessments, is a very severe burden upon them. The rates and government duty on English and Scotch Railways are equal to about fourteen per cent. of the net receipts. The law appears to be that a railway shall be rated upon the amount which it is probable that a third party would give in shape of rent for the railway, and this value is ascertained by taking the gross earnings, and by allowing deductions somewhat as follows:—viz. a percentage for interest upon the capital invested in the moveable carrying stock; a percentage for tenants' profits upon the same capital; a percentage for depreciation of the stock; a sum for the cost of conducting the business as carriers; the annual value of stations and buildings rated separately from the railway; and a sum for renewing rails, sleepers, &c.

The question of rating is undoubtedly difficult. On the one hand, the increased value which is given to land by improvements

---

\* See *Edinburgh Review*, No. 204. October, 1854, an article entitled 'Railway Morals and Railway Policy.'



renders it subject to be rated accordingly; on the other hand, by the terms of an Act passed annually, persons are not liable to be rated for the relief of the poor in respect of their ability derived from their stock in trade. Notwithstanding which the present mode of assessment takes, to some extent, the form of an income tax on railways.

But it is not so much the amount of rate which is objected to by railway companies as the litigation and consequent expense to which this rating gives rise. The railway companies are frequently the largest rate-payers in a parish, and therefore whether they lose or gain their cause, they have to pay the heaviest share of the expense. As an instance of this may be quoted the following cases selected from the 'Railway Times' of last year. The Midland Railway occupies twenty-four acres in the parish of North Thurmaston, upon which it pays 8*l.* 0*s.* 5*d.* per acre, whilst the rate upon the 4844 other acres in the parish is 4*s.* per acre. In Syston, the railway occupies seventeen acres, and pays 6*l.* 4*s.* 7*d.* per acre, whilst upon the remaining 1731 acres the rate per acre is 5*s.* 9*d.* Many other examples are quoted in the same paper. But independently of the general consideration of this question, it appears hard that railway companies should be subjected to so severe a permanent tax for the benefit of the owners of property in those parishes through which their railway passes, as they have been previously made to pay to the landowners very high prices for land and compensation; and they have also greatly increased the value of the land by providing railway communication through it. In a very large number of Canal Acts Parliament limited the amount of rates to that of the agricultural value of the land as it stood before the canal was made.

4. Carriage of parcels by the Post Office. — It is to be regretted that although the railways are essential to the efficiency of the Post Office, and although the traffic on railways is indirectly benefited by the excellence of postal communication, the Post Office authorities and the railway companies do not appear to work together in a friendly spirit. When railways were first introduced into the country, the authorities of the Post Office were so wedded to their mail coaches that they did not foresee that the railway must infallibly become the high way of the country; they therefore took no precautions to obtain fair terms from the railway companies; and now they complain that the railway companies take advantage of their monopoly, and charge too high a price for the accommodation they give. We do not propose to decide between the parties, but the following are the facts: — The railway

companies are obliged to carry the mails, but if they cannot agree with the Post Office upon the amount of remuneration they are to receive, the question is referred to arbitration. Whilst the arbitration is pending, the Post Office make no payments on account, although in some cases an arbitration has lasted for two or three years. The award, when made, is nominally binding on both parties for a specified number of years; but the Post Office can at any time require a change of service, and thus reopen the question. The conveyance of parcels by the Post Office abstracts a considerable number of parcels from the railway companies. The complete organisation which the Post Office possesses over the whole country, especially in the parts remote from railways, gives the Post Office great advantages over the railway companies in competing for this traffic; but, on the other hand, the railway companies have themselves neglected to organise a cheap and complete system of parcel traffic between all the districts to which railways have access. We apprehend that the public would prefer sending their parcels by railway if they felt they could do so cheaply and securely; as the railway company is answerable for the loss of a parcel, whereas the Post Office is not. On the other hand, if public convenience requires that the Post Office should convey parcels, and if by this means it increases its profits, it is but reasonable that the railway companies, upon whom the burden of carrying the extra weight in great part falls, should obtain a share in that profit.

5. Lord Campbell's Compensation Act. — Before this Act passed, railway companies were bound to make good any injuries sustained (through the fault of the companies or their servants) by persons travelling on the railway, but if death ensued no compensation was payable. By Lord Campbell's Act the compensation in case of death was made payable to the relations of the deceased person, and this compensation is unlimited in amount. Since the compensation is calculated in proportion to the money-loss sustained, the death by a railway accident of a bishop, or of a judge, or of a professional man in receipt of a large life income, would entail upon the company a very heavy loss. If it had happened that in the accident at Reigate last spring the Bishop of Oxford (who was a passenger in the injured train) had been killed, the damages would probably have been such as to have affected the Brighton company very severely; or if the same accident had occurred upon the line of its poor neighbour the Caterham Railway Company, whose share capital is 30,000*l.*, the result must have been total annihilation. Sydney Smith had some prophetic idea of

this enactment in his mind, when he said that railway companies would not provide for the safety of passengers until they had killed a bishop. Persons whose death would entail so heavy a loss, or indeed the annihilation of a small company, do not, however, pay any higher rate of insurance when travelling than other passengers.

The railway companies desire that the limitations imposed on losses incurred by ships, or in the transport of merchandise or valuable animals, should be extended to passengers. Any alteration of the law must of course be applicable to all cases where injury or death from negligence has ensued; and there would be some difficulty in laying down a definite principle upon which a limited assessment should be made. Moreover, the public know that they must travel by railway; that the railway companies possess a complete control of the management; that when accidents have occurred, inquiries are hushed up; and that, although in nine cases out of ten the so-called accident is attributable to defective management, instead of the defects being remedied, some unfortunate, and comparatively innocent, servant is punished. Hence, in the absence of publicity as to the causes of railway accidents, in the absence of punishment for defective management, or for the use of unsafe vehicles or roads, the public prefer to hold fast to the strong inducement to good management, which they conceive to be afforded by the chance of a heavy pecuniary penalty in case of accident.

Having thus enumerated the grievances of which railway companies complain, and to which must in part be attributed the low rate of interest which the ordinary shareholders receive, let us turn to the other side of the picture, and consider whether the railway companies have done all they could on their part to improve the value of their property and to promote the interests of the public.

The cheapness and facility of railway communication necessarily give to the railway companies an almost complete monopoly of the carriage of a district. Where canals existed, they have generally bought them up; and they may be considered to have absorbed the whole passengers, merchandise, and mineral traffic of the country. Having thus placed themselves in the position of universal carriers, it is the duty of railway companies, and they are required by law, to convey everything brought to them under similar circumstances at equal prices. It is important, therefore, to consider what are the principles by which the conveyance of traffic is governed on railways, and how the companies have executed the trust of universal carriers which they have assumed.

When a railway has once been constructed, the amount of traffic which flows over it does not depend on the original cost of the line, but upon the capabilities of the district, and upon the charges made for conveyance. If it be desired to bring a commodity into a particular market, the price for conveyance must be so regulated as to leave some profit over the expense of production; and it would pay a railway company to carry the commodity to the market, provided the charge they make be sufficient to leave a profit upon the cost of conveyance. The price which a railway company would ask is also regulated to some extent by the proximity of competing routes, as for instance, the sea, navigable rivers, canals, or other lines of railway. Besides this, if a dealer can send full train loads at stated times, the company may be able to afford to convey his produce at a cheaper rate than that of persons who only send small quantities at uncertain intervals. Hence the charge for conveyance to each market, and for different quantities of the same goods, may vary. If business is slack, and the plant unemployed, a low price may suffice; if it is plentiful, a higher price will be demanded. It is for the railway company, which is thus a dealer in the article of transport, to determine the special rate at which the carriage would be advantageous, just as is the case with a firm trading in a particular commodity. To the manager of the line is committed the duty of fixing these special rates, which are not made public, nor in some cases are they known to any one out of the company, except to the persons to whom they are granted. This secrecy permits, and almost encourages, those who fix the rates, to give advantages occasionally to one trader over another for private purposes. The directors of a railway may own collieries on the line, or the officers of a railway company may have combined amongst themselves to supply the district with coal, and for the conveyance of their coal a very low rate may be charged, whilst other dealers are made to pay a higher rate. In other cases, the railway company may have determined upon supplying the district with coal through its own station agents, throwing every impediment in the way of ordinary dealers and charging them higher rates, upon the plea that the supply is better regulated by the company, and the public consequently better served. In all cases where the companies have themselves turned dealers in any articles, they have driven all private traders off their line by charging the full rates to the traders, and by conveying their own articles at a nominal price.

So with the parcels' traffic: they formerly permitted the large carrying firms, established before the era of railways, to con-

tinue to carry over their lines; they subsequently drove them off by high charges and by harsh treatment.

Railway companies have been formed with the definite object of affording a means of transport to the districts through which they are constructed, and we doubt very much whether the shareholders derive much profit from **any** dealings which pass beyond the legitimate sphere of the company; although such dealings may be advantageous to those of their servants who are employed as commission agents. Such transactions complicate the accounts, and even though they show an apparently large profit, the wear and tear of the stock and road may not have been covered by the low rate charged. We are convinced that as regards the public, the railway companies are more likely to afford fair terms to all comers by strictly limiting themselves to the duty of carrying, than by taking upon themselves the additional duty of dealers.

Let us next consider the passenger traffic, which forms a very large proportion of the income of railway companies. This proportion appears, however, to be decreasing; that is to say, the goods traffic has increased in a greater ratio than the passenger traffic. In 1849 the passenger receipts were 53 per cent. of the total receipts. In 1856 they amounted to only 44 per cent. of the total receipts. Upon the continental railways the proportion varies considerably in different countries: thus, upon the French railways the receipts from passengers appear to be 52 per cent.; whilst in Prussia and Germany the passenger receipts are scarcely one-third of the total receipts; and on the Austrian railways the fares of passengers amount to only 27 per cent. of the total income.\*

In all European countries the passenger traffic is divided into three classes, of which the proportionate number travelling by each class is nearly as follows:—

	1st.	2nd.	3rd.		
British Isles - -	13	32	55	total	100
France - - -	9	33	68	„	100
Germany - - -	1.5	21.5	77	„	100
Austria - - -	2	24	74	„	100

On the German and Austrian railways the first and second classes are nearly identical with the first class on English railways. On the French railways the first, second, and third class carriages are used very much by the same classes as on English railways. In the United States, with the exception of the emigrant class, there is only one class of passengers. The actual number of each class of passenger in the British Isles was in

		1st.	2nd.	3rd.
1849	-	7,292,812	23,521,650	32,890,322
1856	-	17,117,477	40,666,162	71,531,557

The receipts per mile for each class were

		1st.	2nd.	3rd.
In 1849	-	£345	£454	£326
1856	-	£352	£404	£413

and the actual receipts

		1st.	2nd.	3rd.
1849	-	£1,927,768	£2,530,969	£1,816,476
1856	-	£2,992,161	£3,438,981	£3,512,228

It thus appears that the traffic which shows the greatest tendency to increase, is the third class traffic. But this traffic is the one which has received the smallest encouragement. On many lines there is only one third class train each way daily; the carriages are purposely ill ventilated and ill lighted, with the avowed object of compelling the passenger to travel in the second class. Similarly, second class carriages are made as uncomfortable as possible, in order to drive passengers into first class carriages. This policy is dictated by the idea that persons must of necessity travel, and that therefore as much should be got out of each passenger as possible on each journey. This idea is, however, erroneous. No doubt a very large class do travel upon business, but if travelling be uncomfortable and expensive, the business which would have otherwise occupied two journeys, will be condensed into one.

On the French railways more accommodation is afforded to the lower class traffic; and we find from the published returns for 1853, that for that year

	1st.	2nd.	3rd.
The receipts per mile were -	£337	£327	£496
And the total receipts -	£790,701	£767,472	£1,164,741

thus showing a more decided preponderance of receipt from the third class traffic. The statistical Report on French Railways drawn up in 1856 for the Minister of Public Works, observes on this subject, that 'the comfort of the carriages has very little to do with the numbers travelling in the different classes, but that the selection of the class is regulated by the speed of the trains.'

We are not in favour of an indiscriminate lowering of fares, but the profit of a railway company must be made rather from the conveyance of large masses for short distances and at low rates than from conveying a few for long distances and at high rates; and, therefore, whilst retaining high prices for those

who are willing to pay for superior accommodation, attention, and high speed, every facility should be afforded for developing the third class traffic; the accommodation given in the third class carriages being such as to reduce to the smallest point the necessity of attention from the railway officials, which forms an important element in the cost of passengers' traffic. As a mere question of transport a load of human beings is a very cheap description of cargo, because it walks into the carriages, and walks away at the end of the journey; this has been recognised by railway companies in the case of excursion trains, in which trains fully loaded are run at very low rates. It cannot, however, be expected that as soon as third class accommodation is afforded in a district the trains will be at once filled. This traffic has been habitually repressed, and the habits of the lower classes have been formed accordingly. But railway companies should look to the future. The upper and middle classes have learned to consider a railway journey as easy as a drive or a walk; but the limit of travelling by those classes must have been nearly reached; there is, however, no strictly drawn line between their habits and those of the lower classes; the latter would similarly use the railway if it were placed within their reach; the farmer would often willingly dispense with his horse, and the artisan would often be willing to be carried to his work, if he could do so at a cheap rate. In developing cheap local traffic, great punctuality is a first necessity, otherwise the time lost in waiting at stations is more than equivalent to the saving; and besides punctuality, the hours at which the trains are timed to run, and the price, should never vary.

It is not, however, from exceptional rates, or from imperfections in the development of the traffic on railways that the want of profit alone occurs; from these causes the companies may not always fill their trains, and not always be adequately paid for the accommodation they furnish. But they also occasionally give too high a price for the commodities that they purchase. The manufacturer who supplies an article desires sometimes to propitiate the agent whose duty it is to receive and to approve it. For instance, a present of a grand piano, or something equivalent, may precede the arrival of a new locomotive, in order to ensure the locomotive's being approved of by the officer appointed for the purpose; any *pot de vin* (as the French call it) of this nature must be finally paid by the company.

The considerations which we have enumerated above show that it is necessary that the charge for transport should be regulated to some extent by the price of the articles in different markets, and that trains should never be run at a loss: it is

therefore essential to efficient management that the accounts of railway companies should show how the expenditure is apportioned over each description of service. To ascertain this, the cost of each part of the railway, the work done by it, and by the vehicles upon it, must be recorded. Yet the information possessed and recorded by the companies on these essential points is extremely defective. The consumption of coal is affected by the state of the road: thus in America, where the joints of the rails are very bad, the consumption of fuel for the same amount of work is higher than in this country. It is also affected by the condition of the several parts of the rolling stock, and this can only be traced by keeping an account of the performance of the different parts of the vehicles. The vehicles on a railway should be utilised to the utmost, and to effect this the daily position and performance of each should be recorded. On the best continental lines information of this nature is carefully collected and studied; but, as a rule, English railway companies have not yet learnt that the additional cost of the few clerks who would be required for collecting this information would soon be repaid by a clearer knowledge of the financial position of each branch of the railway-service, and by the increased facility for checking waste or abuses.

The several points to which we have called attention show that it is not by legislation alone that railway property can be placed on a sound footing, but that much must be done by the companies themselves. The interests of the shareholders will never be properly guarded until the guardians they appoint are adequately remunerated, and made strictly accountable for the trust they assume. But at present the shareholders are almost powerless to interfere in the management of their property. The directors are elected for a specified term, and cannot be removed until that term has expired. They have full control of the funds, and can apply them to any purposes they choose; they can, or rather do, nominate the auditors, through whom alone the shareholders could practically obtain any knowledge of the funds being mispent;—if opposed, the directors can use the money of the company to canvass for votes in their support; whereas, the expenses of individual shareholders must be borne by themselves. Is it astonishing, therefore, that shareholders take so little interest in the management of the concerns in which they have invested their money? The office of director is much sought after; but it affords little return in money for the sacrifice of time which it entails; hence it can only be supposed that the directors are paid by collateral advantages in the shape of either extra civility, free passes, patronage, low rates, or some



other consideration. If able and experienced men are required to devote their whole time to the management of a railway, they must be well paid and endowed with full power. But at the same time the shareholders must guard against fraud, collusion or mismanagement, by establishing an efficient audit.

We do not mean by the term audit merely the accurate examination of vouchers and disbursements. We consider that 'whilst it is a *managerial* function to prescribe and regulate the means, and to provide such checks and counter-checks upon its working as shall insure the fullest return for service rendered, and permit the greatest development of its capabilities, it is the function of the *auditor* to determine, on behalf of his constituents, the value, sufficiency, and completion of such arrangements.\*' The audit of railway accounts should follow out the details of every transaction. The auditor should trace out whether the company had rendered services at too low a price, or given too high a consideration for materials, work or other value received. He should trace out whether full use is made of the means at the disposal of the manager, and whether the sources of revenue are properly developed. He should show whether the expenditure has all been *bonâ fide* expenditure for the legitimate purposes of the railway, or whether it includes also charges for new projects, or for opposition to other companies, or for fanciful objects of the directors, which have not been sanctioned by the shareholders. The auditor should further cause the accounts to be so made up as to enable the shareholders to understand the *true* position of their affairs.

We\* have endeavoured, as briefly as was consistent with so vast a subject, to sketch out the present state of the railway system. We have shown that the promoters of railways had to establish a new principle of locomotion in the face of hostile landowners, adverse interests, and a blind legislature, instead of being assisted in a discovery, which by cheapening transport has been a positive accession of wealth to the community; that after the value of railways was recognised, the legislature allowed and encouraged a headlong course of speculation and competition, which, whilst it has no doubt developed the resources of the country, is productive of great loss to those with whose money these competing lines were made; that the absence of all system in the private bill legislation is still a grievous evil to the community; that the railway interest is subjected to litigation and heavy local burdens, by the parties whose property has

---

\* Audit Defined and Explained. Waterlow. 1857.

been chiefly improved: but, on the other hand, railway companies have spent large sums in reckless competition with each other; they have not, on their part, managed their property in the most careful and judicious manner; and they have not fulfilled the duty of universal carriers which they have assumed, with a due regard to the interests and the requirements of the public. However much may be due from the nation to the promoters of railways, it is clear that the removal of burdens by legislation will not suffice to place railway property in a paying condition. The improvement must emanate from the railway interest; and we are convinced that if they were to unite in a comprehensive and practical scheme for placing railway property on a sound basis, in which the interests of the public (really identical with their own) received due consideration, Parliament would be ready to assist them.

---

ART. V.—*The Works of the late Edgar Allan Poe; with a Memoir by* RUFUS WILMOT GRISWOLD, *and Notices of his Life and Genius by* N. P. WILLIS and J. R. LOWELL. 4 vols. New York: 1857.

EDGAR ALLAN POE was indcontestibly one of the most worthless persons of whom we have any record in the world of letters. Many authors may have been as idle; many as improvident; some as drunken and dissipated; and a few, perhaps, as treacherous and ungrateful; but *he* seems to have succeeded in attracting and combining, in his own person, all the floating vices which genius had hitherto shown itself capable of grasping in its widest and most eccentric orbit. As the faults of this writer present themselves more upon a level with the ordinary gaze than the loftier qualities which his friends ascribe to him, we shall venture to introduce him to the reader, in the first instance, by his humbler every day actions; satisfied that it is not of much moment how a picture has been commenced, if the proportions prove correct at last. Fuseli, as we know, preferred beginning his sketch of the human figure at the lowest point, and worked from the foot upwards. In like manner, we shall begin with the defects,—or, to give them their true title, with the substantial vices, of Edgar Poe,—proposing to ourselves to ascend ultimately to his virtues, should we discover any; at all events, to those rare qualities and endowments, the demonstration of which has entitled him to no mean place on the rolls of the Temple of Fame.

He was, as we have said, a blackguard of undeniable mark. Yet his chances of success at the outset of life were great and manifold. Nature was bountiful to him; bestowing upon him a pleasing person and excellent talents. Fortune favoured him; education and society expanded and polished his intellect, and improved his manner into an insinuating and almost irresistible address. Upon these foundations he took his stand; became early very popular amongst his associates; and might have erected a laudable reputation, had he possessed ordinary prudence. But he defied his good Genius. There was a perpetual strife between him and virtue, in which virtue was never triumphant. His moral stamen was weak, and demanded resolute treatment; but instead of seeking a bracing and healthy atmosphere, he preferred the impurer airs, and gave way readily to those low and vulgar appetites, which infallibly relax and press down the victim to the lowest state of social abasement.

He arrived at the end of his descent, after many alarms, many warnings, that might have deterred him, and induced him to try another course. For the most instructive teaching of Edgar Poe was in the roughest school of life. He had, indeed, for a brief period the advantage of some grave counsel at Charlottesville. But he left that place early, when his intellect was merely in its adolescent state. It was in his subsequent transit through poverty and degradation, when he had to battle not only with the world, but also with those compunctious visitors that force their way into the most obstinate bosom, that he received his most valuable lessons. The natural soil, however, was barren of good. The seed was sown upon a rock; or, if the reader prefer it, upon one of those shifting unprofitable sands which no culture will bring into fertility.

It seems impossible to have kept him upright. His tendency was decidedly downwards. He was, time after time, cautioned, forgiven, punished. All tender expostulation, all severe measures, were alike unavailable. The usual prizes of life, — reputation, competency, friendship, love, — presented themselves in turn; but they were all in turn neglected or forfeited, — repeatedly, in fact, abandoned, under the detestable passion for drink. He outraged his benefactor, he deceived his friends, he sacrificed his love, — he became a beggar, — a vagabond, — the slanderer of a woman, — the delirious drunken pauper of a common hospital, — hated by some — despised by others — and avoided by all respectable men. The weakness of human nature has, we imagine, its limit; but the biography of Poe has satisfied us that the lowest

abyss of moral imbecility and disrepute was never attained until he came, and stood forth a warning to the times to come.

We say all this very unwillingly; for we admire sincerely many things that Mr. Poe has produced. We are willing to believe that there may have been, as Mrs. Osgood has stated, an amiable side to his character; and that his mother-in-law had cause to lament his loss. We learn, moreover, from Mr. Willis, that at one time, in the later portion of his life, 'he was in-variably punctual and industrious.' The testimony of that gentleman and of Mr. Lowell (both men of eminence in literature,) tempted us at first to suspend our opinion of the author; but the weight of evidence on the darker side proved overwhelming, and left us no choice but to admit the fact upon record, and to stigmatise with our most decided reprobation those misdeeds that seem to have constituted almost the only history of his short career.

And, here, let it not be surmised that Poe was an 'enemy only to himself.' His was, as Mr. Griswold states, a 'shrewd' and naturally unamiable character.' We refuse our assent to the argument of one of his advocates, that 'his whole nature was reversed by a single glass of wine;' and that 'his insulting arrogance and bad heartedness' had no deeper origin than a modicum of that agreeable liquid. We lean rather to the ancient proverb, which asserts that Truth is made manifest upon convivial occasions. Moreover, his ingratitude and insults towards Mr. Allan, Mr. White, Mr. Burton, and his affianced wife, — his harsh and dishonest criticisms upon Mr. Osborn and Mr. Jones (each, in fact, contradicted by himself) and others, were not momentary flashes of ill humour; while his long and elaborate depreciation of Mr. Longfellow (one part of it meriting particular condemnation), and finally his deliberate threats of publicly slandering a lady merely because she claimed the return of a loan of money, cannot by possibility be referred to so feeble and temporary an impetus as 'a single glass of wine.' They sprang undoubtedly from what Mr. Griswold calls 'his naturally unamiable character.'

To this and to his moral weakness must be ascribed the melancholy and poverty which we are told overshadowed his life. That he was very often unhappy we have no doubt; but that condition of mind was obviously referable to his excesses. It was the collapse after the high-strained revel. That he was frequently poor enough is also very probable; and yet, what is that but saying that he shared the ordinary fortunes of authors, many of whom too readily barter for the pleasures of writing and popularity, or the remote chances of future fame, those material

comforts which are found to spring generally from regular mechanical industry, or other unexciting employments of common life. Some of these men, however, endure poverty very bravely; some, with little help and no sympathy; some for years, — some for all their humble and laborious days. They begin life with bright hopes and resolute hearts. They see above them Parnassus or Helicon, quite accessible. There is El Dorado also, in the misty distance. Yet they work on, from hour to hour, from week to week, without much repining. And, at the end of many years, perhaps, they discover that their only reward has been in the shape of a vulgar payment, — a loaf of bread, a pot of beer, and an empty garret. Finally, they die without an historian to chronicle their labours, or even to notice their having once existed. Their very comrades content themselves with looking out for better fare to-morrow, and pass on to another friend.

We now turn, without more ado, to the biography and Works before us. In the front of the first volume is the portrait of the author. It deserves note. His friends speak of his pale and beautiful face. Upon ourselves the impression made is very different. It seems rather to confirm the opinion derived from his history and writings. It seems to us pinched, painful, jealous, irritable, and weak; and is altogether wanting in that frank, manly, generous character which takes the fancy of the beholder at the first glance.

Edgar Allan Poe, we are told, was the son of an American father and an English mother. On the death of his respectable parents, which event occurred when he was about six years of age, he was thrown penniless upon the world. Providence decreed that he should be adopted by a rich and benevolent merchant, Mr. John Allan. This gentleman took him to England; placed him at school there for four or five years; and, on his return to the United States, entered him at the University of Charlottesville. Here the youth broke loose from the trammels of authority, and distinguished himself not only by his talents, but by the wildest excesses. It is argued, in his excuse, that the manners of the University at this time were extremely dissolute. Poe, however, young as he was, exceeded all his fellows. Not only, it is said, was he 'the wildest and most reckless student of his class;' but he mastered the most difficult problems with ease, and kept 'all the while in the first rank for scholarship.' He would, in fact, have graduated in the highest honours, had not his gambling, intemperance, and other vices induced his expulsion from the University. Thus early

did the demon disclose itself which was to have such an overwhelming influence on his future life.

His allowance of money at Charlottesville had been liberal; yet he quitted that place very much in debt, and when Mr. Allan refused to pay some of his losses at gaming, he wrote him an abusive letter and left his house.

For about a year he seems to have wandered through Europe; but at the end of that time he contrives to reach St. Petersburg, where the American minister (Mr. Middleton) is summoned one day to save him from the penalties of a drunken debauch. Through this gentleman's kindness Poe is enabled to return to America. Mr. Allan (although he is now not so cordial as formerly) declares himself still willing to serve the culprit, and, at his request, exerts his interest and obtains a scholarship in the military academy. Here Poe works assiduously for some months, but his habits of dissipation are renewed, and in 'ten months from his matriculation he is cashiered.'

Upon this second expulsion he goes once more to the house of Mr. Allan, at Richmond, who is even then disposed to treat him as a son, but Poe, by some very offensive act, forces his old patron to close his doors against him. At this time it appears that Mr. Allan had married, for his second wife, a Miss Pater-son, who was considerably younger than himself. Poe's own account of this offence is that *he only ridiculed this marriage of his benefactor*, and had a quarrel with his wife. But a much darker story is told on the other side, and one that is said to be diametrical to Poe's character. That the offence was very grave is undoubted, inasmuch as Mr. Allan, hitherto so repeatedly forgiving, thought it necessary to banish the 'adopted son' from his house, and refused to see him again. On this gentleman's death, in 1834, it was found that of his large property 'not a mill' was bequeathed to Poe.

Our future author now endeavours to earn his bread by printing a volume of poems, and by contributing to the journals. The result is a failure; and his next step is to enlist as a private soldier, and then—to desert. His friends surmise that he probably did not like the 'monotony of a soldier's life.' It does not appear that he encountered the punishment which he deserved for his breach of military discipline; but that he had to fare hardly is clearly the case. For he subsequently contests for, and (almost as a matter of course) obtains, a certain prize offered by the proprietor of 'The Baltimore Saturday Visitor;' and upon the occasion comes forward in a state of the most squalid poverty. His destitute condition, indeed, operates so effectually on some compassionate people, especially on a Mr.

Kennedy, that he is sent to a clothing store, and afterwards to a bath, in order to enable him to recover, outwardly at least, the appearance of a gentleman.

By the help of his new friends he obtains the editorship of a 'Richmond Magazine,' but after a short time is found 'in a condition of brutish drunkenness,' which 'results in his dismissal.' His employer at this period was a Mr. White, a gentleman evidently kind and long-enduring, but who at the same time speaks very plainly to 'Edgar,' consenting to take him back as an assistant, only on condition that he will 'promise to separate from the bottle.' This promise is of course speedily made, — and as speedily broken.

We are not able to ascertain the precise date at which he borrowed a poem from Professor Longfellow, imitated it, and afterwards *denounced the author as a plagiarist from himself, the Simulator.* The mimic poem is called 'The Haunted House,' and is one of Poe's best pieces of verse. The original is 'The Beleaguered City,' of Mr. Longfellow. There are, necessarily, statement and counterstatement in this case; but while we have the most entire reliance on Mr. Longfellow's word, we confess that we place none whatever on the assertion of Edgar Poe.

Poe's next appearance is as a writer in a magazine established by Mr. Burton, in Philadelphia. He remains with this gentleman till June, 1840, more than a year. This long lapse into sobriety is followed by the usual fit of intemperance. 'On one occasion returning after the regular day of publication, he [Mr. Burton] found the number unfinished, and Poe incapable of duty.' Notwithstanding this the wretched culprit is forgiven, and accepted again as a coadjutor in the magazine, his employer however addressing to him some words of counsel, from which may be discerned a fresh and not very favourable feature in Poe's character: —

'You must get rid,' Mr. Burton advises, 'of your avowed ill-feelings toward your brother authors. You say the people love havoc. I think they love justice. I think you yourself would not have written the article on Dawes, in a more healthy state of mind. I am not frammelled by any vulgar consideration of expediency. I would rather lose money than by such undue severity wound the feelings of a kind-hearted and honourable man. I regret your word-catching spirit.'

This letter, at once so sensible and so honourable to its writer, was productive of no good result. It would seem rather to have generated, or, to speak more correctly, to have encouraged the growth of some of those seeds of malignity and ingratitude

which had been slumbering in the breast of his correspondent ; for,

‘In two or three months afterwards Burton went out of town to fulfil a professional engagement, leaving material and directions for completing the next number of the magazine in four days. He was absent nearly a fortnight, and on his return he found that his printer in the meanwhile had not received a line of copy ; but that Poe had prepared the prospectus of a new monthly, and obtained transcripts of his subscription and account books, to be used in a scheme for supplanting him!’

From the house of Mr. Burton our author migrates to that of Mr. Graham, where he is installed as editor of ‘Graham’s Magazine.’ He works there for a short time, and is again dismissed. He then tries to establish a journal of his own, called ‘The Stylus,’ but fails, and eventually, in 1844, removes to New York. Here he distinguishes himself by borrowing fifty dollars from a ‘celebrated literary lady.’ On failing to repay them on the day promised ; and being asked for an acknowledgment of the debt, to be shown to the lady’s husband, he at once denies all knowledge of the transaction, and threatens to exhibit, to the husband, a correspondence which, as he states, ‘would make the woman infamous, if she said any more on the subject.’ Such correspondence had never existed !

After being made acquainted with this act, which could only have emanated from a creature in the very lowest condition of depravity, the reader will naturally dismiss from his breast all sympathy with the good or bad fortune of Mr. Edgar Poe.

The few remaining incidents of his life afford little, or no variety or relief from the foregoing history. They are all tinged by the same gloom. His wife, whom he had married when residing at Richmond, dies. During her last illness, her mother is met going about from place to place, in the bitter weather, half-starved and thinly clad, with a poem or some other literary article, which she was striving to sell ; or otherwise she was begging for him and his poor partner, both being in want of the commonest necessities of life.

Nevertheless, even after this prostration, Poe seems to have arisen for a short period, and to have signalized himself by some more literary activity. He wrote an essay, entitled ‘Eureka,’ delivered lectures, and—his wife being then dead—engaged himself to marry ‘one of the most brilliant women of New England.’ This engagement, however, is one that he means to break. ‘Mark me,’ he says, ‘I shall not marry her.’ In furtherance of this gentlemanlike decision, he deliberately gets drunk, and on the evening before the appointed bridal is found



'reeling through the streets, and in his drunkenness commits, at her house, such outrages as render it necessary to summon the police.' He went from New York with a '*determination thus to induce the ending of the engagement, and—succeeded.*'

His last journey is now to be taken. He travels as far as Baltimore, but never returns. He is seen a short time afterwards in that city, in such a state as is induced by long-continued intoxication, and after, 'a night of insanity and exposure,' he is carried to a hospital, and there, on the evening of Sunday, the 7th day of October, 1849, he dies, at the age of thirty-eight years!

One of his biographers concludes with the words, 'It is a melancholy history.' We trust that it will prove a profitable one; for unless we are mistaken, it involves a moral that may be studied with advantage by future authors.

We have now to offer an opinion on the peculiar features and literary value of Poe's productions in prose and verse. In reference to the former, we are disposed to think that we can trace his inspiration in a great measure to the writings of Godwin and Charles Brocken Browne. There is in each the same love of the morbid and improbable; the same frequent straining of the interest; the same tracing, step by step, logically as it were and elaborately, through all its complicated relations, a terrible mystery to its source. These authors pursue events through all their possible involutions, but seldom deal with character. There is indeed a singular want of the dramatic faculty in all these eminent persons. Godwin, it is true, in his '*Fleetwood*' and '*Mandeville*,' and Browne in '*Ormond*,' and '*Arthur Mervyn*,' made an effort to draw forth some human peculiarities; but their personages are little more, after all, than stately abstractions or impersonations of certain moods or guesses of their own minds, the results of solitary thinking. Whatever latent qualities they possess, each of their figures reminds one somewhat of the cocoon, — a thing drawn from the entrails of its parent, with no apparent vitality about it.

Notwithstanding the appearance of originality, due perhaps more to the eccentricity of his life and the deformity of his moral character than to the vigour or freshness of his intellect, it is easy to trace throughout Edgar Poe's writings impressions derived from authors he had chanced to read or contrivances which had dwelt in his memory. So little indeed can he be considered a truly original writer, that he perpetually reminds us of something we have read before. Sometimes he imitates the matter-of-fact precision that gives such reality to the fictions of Defoe;

sometimes he pursues the fantastical or horrible night inares of Hoffman; sometimes a thought visits him from the highly-wrought philosophy of Novalis, or the huge and irregular genius of Jean Paul; sometimes he loses himself, like the Louis Lambert of Balzac, in the labyrinth of transcendental speculation. But though he resembles these writers in his love of the marvellous, and in his ingenious treatment of it, he is inferior to the least of them in depth. His reading was doubtless curious rather than accurate, desultory rather than wide; and his genius grew rank in a half-cultivated soil.\*

Considered apart from his poetry, Poe's fictions seem to resolve themselves for the most part into two classes: — one like those to which we have already adverted, where a series of facts woven mysteriously out of some unknown premises are brought apparently to a logical result; the other, where the author deals strictly with a single event; where there is little or no preliminary matter, but the reader is at once hurried into a species of catastrophe, or conclusion of the most exciting character. 'These last-mentioned fictions are necessarily short, because the sympathy of the reader could not possibly remain at the high point of tension to which he is raised by the torture of the scene. In a few instances we encounter merely a gloomy scene, (sometimes very highly wrought and picturesque,) or a human being fashioned out of the most ghastly materials, — a tale, in short, without any result, properly speaking. We look in at the death-bed of a man: we see him writhe — utter a few words referable to some imperfectly disclosed event; or he professes to expound, under mesmeric influence, while he is dying, or *when he is dead*, certain things which the human mind in its wakeful healthy state is quite incapable of comprehending.

It should not be forgotten that in some of these sketches, which are the most mysterious in their treatment, the author has contrived to absolve himself from the necessity of verifying, in his usual manner, the rationale of his design. He ascends

\* It is a curious example of his superficial acquaintance with the literature of other lands, that in recapitulating the titles of a mysterious library of books in the 'House of Usher,' he quotes among a list of cabalistic volumes Gresset's 'Vertvert,' evidently in complete ignorance of what he is talking about. Gresset's 'Vertvert' is the antipodes of Poe's 'Raven'; but the comic interest of the former poem, and the tragic interest of the latter, turns alike on the reiteration of *bird-language*: and it is not impossible that Poe may have had in his mind some vague impression or recollection of Gresset's celebrated parrot.

into the cloudiest regions of metaphysics, of speculation, — of conjecture — of dreams! God, as we learn, amongst other things, from 'Mesmeric revelation,' is 'unparticled matter.' From M. Valdemar we collect, that a man, thrown into a mesmeric state just before death, will not only speak *after death*, but will remain unaltered for some months afterwards, and only betray the frail and crumbling evidence of his mortality, when a few 'mesmeric 'passes' have succeeded in restoring him to his real decayed condition. He then falls to pieces and dissolves, 'a mass of 'loathsome putrescence.' — That such sketches were considered by the author as unimportant, and not as a grand or final effort to ensure himself a name in the literature of his country, we can readily believe. Nevertheless, there is surely something very morbid in all these fancies and prolusions of the intellect.

There can be no question but that Edgar Poe possessed much subtlety of thought; an acute reasoning faculty; imagination of a gloomy character, and a remarkable power of analysis. This last quality, which from its frequent use almost verges upon disease, pervaded nearly all his stories, and is in effect his main characteristic. Other persons have drawn as unreservedly from the depths of horror. But few others, with the exception of Browne and Godwin, have devoted themselves to that curious persevering analysis of worldly mysteries by which Poe has earned so large a portion of his reputation. The impression made upon the mind of the reader by the apparently wonderful solutions of the most difficult problems will not easily be forgotten. Yet, on examining the marvel more attentively, he will divest himself of a good deal of his admiration, by reflecting (as Dr. Griswold justly observes) that the ingenuity is displayed 'in unravelling a web which has been woven for the express 'purpose of unravelling.' Every man, in fact, is able readily to explain the riddle which he himself has fabricated, however laborious the process of manufacturing it may have been.

How far the thrilling interest which Poe infused into his stories may be traced to the acute sensations which he himself endured in a state of excitement or despondency, we have no means of knowing. But we think that no writer would have resorted so incessantly to the violent measures and extreme distresses which constitute the subject of his narratives, in a good sound condition of health. His imagination appears to have been absolutely embarrassed by a profusion of visionary alarms and horrors. We rise up from his pages as from the spectacle of some frightful disaster, — relieved because the worst is over, and happy that we are left at last to partake of less stirring pleasures, and to return to the calmer sensations of ordinary life.

Edgar Poe had no humour, properly so called. His laugh was feeble, or it was a laugh of ill-temper, exhibiting little beyond the turbulence of his own mind. He was carping and sarcastic, and threw out occasionally a shower of sharp words upon the demerits of his contemporaries; but of that genial humour which shines through a character, fixes it in a class, and shows by what natural gradations it moves, and by what aspects and impulses it claims to resemble the large brotherhood of man, he possessed nothing. The ordinary incidents of life — the domestic affections, the passions, the intermixture of good and evil, of strength and weakness, in the great human family who pass by our doors every day, and who sit beside us, love us, serve us, maltreat us (as the varying mood prompts) were unknown to him, or disregarded. Yet these things constitute the staple — the best and most essential parts of the modern novel. They intrude themselves, in fact, into our acquaintance, so frequently, so intimately, that we cannot ignore their existence. In the present case, we are at a loss to understand how a person so acute as our author could have neglected to place upon record what must have so incessantly forced itself upon his observation; nay, what must have met and jostled him so frequently in his rough journey through life.

Of the tales in which the analytical power of the author is more obviously exerted, the least unpleasant are 'The Purloined Letter,' and 'The Golden Bug.' 'The Murders in the Rue Morgue,' and 'The Mystery of Marie Roget,' are, like too many of his other fictions, saturated with blood. In order that the reader may satisfy his curiosity as to the construction of these plots, the stories themselves must be read. It is quite impossible, in the space at present at our command, to transcribe either of these stories, and without such complete transcription the mysterious minute details, in which and in the tracing and solution of which the merit resides, cannot be explained. We elect, therefore, to take our extract from a sketch in which another quality of the author's mind can be shown.

A youth is supposed to be sitting on the top of a cliff or mountain overlooking the sea. It is called 'Helseggen the cloudy,' and arose, a sheer unobstructed precipice of black shining rock, some fifteen or sixteen hundred feet high. The youth's companion, an old fisherman, bids him look out towards the Norway coast, — beyond the belt of vapour beneath us, into the sea.

'We had now been about ten minutes upon the top of Helseggen, to which we had ascended from the interior of Lofoden, so that

we had caught no glimpse of the sea until it had burst upon us from the summit. As the old man spoke, I became aware of a loud and gradually increasing sound, like the moaning of a vast herd of buffaloes upon an American prairie; and at the same moment I perceived that what seamen term the *chopping* character of the ocean beneath us was rapidly changing into a current which set to the eastward. Even while I gazed, this current acquired a monstrous velocity. Each moment added to its speed — to its headlong impetuosity. In five minutes the whole sea, as far as Vurrgh, was lashed into ungovernable fury; but it was between Moskoe and the coast that the main uproar held its sway. Here the vast bed of the waters, seamed and scarred into a thousand conflicting channels, burst suddenly into phrensied convulsion — heaving, boiling, hissing — gyrating in gigantic and innumerable vortices, and all whirling and plunging on to the eastward with a rapidity which water never elsewhere assumes, except in precipitous descents.

In a few minutes more, there came over the scene another radical alteration. The general surface grew somewhat more smooth, and the whirlpools, one by one, disappeared, while prodigious streaks of foam became apparent where none had been seen before. These streaks, at length, spreading out to a great distance, and entering into combination, took unto themselves the gyratory motion of the subsided vortices, and seemed to form the germ of another more vast. Suddenly — very suddenly — this assumed a distinct and definite existence, in a circle of more than a mile in diameter. The edge of the whirl was represented by a broad belt of gleaming spray; but no particle of this slipped into the mouth of the terrific funnel, whose interior, as far as the eye could fathom it, was a smooth, shining, and jet-black wall of water, inclined to the horizon at an angle of some forty-five degrees, speeding dizzily round and round with a swaying and sweltering motion, and sending forth to the winds an appalling voice, half shriek, half roar, such as not even the mighty cataract of Niagara ever lifts up in its agony to Heaven.

The mountain trembled to its very base, and the rock rocked. I threw myself upon my face, and clung to the scant herbage in an excess of nervous agitation.

“This,” said I at length, to the old man — “this *can* be nothing else than the great whirlpool of the Maelstrom.”

“So it is sometimes termed,” said he. “We Norwegians call it the Moskoe-ström, from the island of Moskoe in the midway.” (Vol. i. pp. 163, 164.)

‘You have had a good look at the whirl,’ says the old man, ‘and now I’ll tell you a story that will convince you that I ought to know something of the Moskoe-ström.’ And he accordingly tells him how he and his brothers, having been out fishing one day, three years ago, and being about to return home, but having mistaken the hour, were met by an adverse wind. It was fresh on their starboard quarter, and favourable when they set out, but all at once they were taken aback by an

unusual breeze from over Helseggen. They could not make way, and one of them was proposing to return to their anchorage, when they observed the whole of the horizon covered with a singular copper-coloured cloud, that 'rose with the most amazing velocity.' In a minute the storm was upon them. The masts went by the board, taking with them the narrator's younger brother. He and his elder brother, however, cling to the barque.

"For some moments we were completely deluged, as I say, and all this time I held my breath, and clung to the bolt. When I could stand it no longer I raised myself upon my knees, still keeping hold with my hands, and thus got my head clear. Presently our little boat gave herself a shake, just as a dog does in coming out of the water, and thus rid herself, in some measure, of the seas. I was now trying to get the better of the stupor that had come over me, and to collect my senses so as to see what was to be done, when I felt somebody grasp my arm. It was my elder brother, and my heart leaped for joy, for I had made sure that he was overboard — but the next moment all this joy was turned into horror — for he put his mouth close to my ear, and screamed out the word '*Moskoe-ström!*'

"No one ever will know what my feelings were at that moment. I shook from head to foot as if I had had the most violent fit of the ague. I knew what he meant by that one word well enough — I knew what he wished to make me understand. With the wind that now drove us on, we were bound for the whirl of the Ström, and nothing could save us!

"You perceive that in crossing the Ström channel, we always went a long way up above the whirl, even in the calmest weather, and then had to wait and watch carefully for the slack — but now we were driving right upon the pool itself, and in such a hurricane as this! 'To be sure,' I thought, 'we shall get there just about the slack — there is some little hope in that' — but in the next moment I cursed myself for being so great a fool as to dream of hope at all. I knew very well that we were doomed, had we been ten times a ninety-gun ship." (Vol. i. pp. 169, 170.)

They are now within a quarter of a mile of the Moskoe-ström. They recognise the place, but it is no more like the every-day whirlpool than the whirlpool itself is like a mill race.

"It could not have been more than two minutes afterwards when we suddenly felt the waves subside, and were enveloped in foam. The boat made a sharp half turn to larboard, and then shot off in its new direction like a thunderbolt. At the same moment the roaring noise of the water was completely drowned in a kind of shrill shriek — such a sound as you might imagine given out by the water-pipes of many thousand steam vessels, letting off their steam all together. We were now in the belt of surf that always surrounds the whirl; and I thought, of course, that another moment would plunge us into the

abyss — down which we could only see indistinctly on account of the amazing velocity with which we were borne along. The boat did not seem to sink into the water at all, but to skim like an air-bubble upon the surface of the surge. Her starboard side was next the whirl, and on the larboard arose the world of ocean we had left. It stood like a huge writhing wall between us and the horizon.

“How often we made the circuit of the belt it is impossible to say. We careered round and round for perhaps an hour, flying rather than floating, getting gradually more and more into the middle of the surge, and then nearer and nearer to its horrible inner edge. All this time I had never left go of the ring-bolt. My brother was at the stern, holding on to a small empty water-cask which had been securely lashed under the coop of the counter, and was the only thing on deck that had not been swept overboard when the gale first took us. As we approached the brink of the pit he let go his hold upon this, and made for the ring, from which, in the agony of his terror, he endeavoured to force my hands, as it was not large enough to afford us both a secure grasp. I never felt deeper grief than when I saw him attempt this act — although I knew he was a madman when he did it — a raving maniac through sheer fright. I did not care, however, to contest the point with him. I knew it could make no difference, whether either of us held on at all; so I let him have the bolt, and went astern to the cask. This there was no great difficulty in doing; for the smack flew round steadily enough, and upon an even keel — only swaying to and fro, with the immense sweeps and swelters of the whirl. Scarcely had I secured myself in my new position, when we gave a wild lurch to starboard, and rushed headlong into the abyss. I muttered a hurried prayer to God, and thought all was over.

“As I felt the sickening sweep of the descent, I had instinctively tightened my hold upon the barrel, and closed my eyes. For some seconds I dared not open them — while I expected instant destruction, and wondered that I was not already in my death-struggles with the water. But moment after moment elapsed. I still lived. The sense of falling had ceased; and the motion of the vessel seemed much as it had been before, while in the belt of foam, with the exception that she now lay more along. I took courage and looked once again upon the scene.

“Never shall I forget the sensations of awe, horror, and admiration with which I gazed about me. The boat appeared to be hanging, as if by magic, midway down, upon the interior surface of a funnel vast in circumference, prodigious in depth, and whose perfectly smooth sides might have been mistaken for ebony, but for the bewildering rapidity with which they spun around, and for the glancing and ghastly radiance they shot forth, as the rays of the full moon, from that circular rift amid the clouds which I have already described, streamed in a flood of golden glory along the black walls and far away down into the inmost recesses of the abyss.

“At first I was too much confused to observe anything accurately. The general burst of terrific grandeur was all that I beheld.

When I recovered myself a little, however, my gaze fell instinctively downwards. In this direction I was able to obtain an unobstructed view, from the manner in which the smack hung on the inclined surface of the pool. She was quite upon an even keel — that is to say, her deck lay in a plane parallel with that of the water — but this latter sloped at an angle of more than forty-five degrees, so that we seemed to be lying upon our beam-ends. I could not help observing, nevertheless, that I had scarcely more difficulty in maintaining my hold and footing in this situation, than if we had been upon a dead level; and this, I suppose, was owing to the speed at which we revolved.

“The rays of the moon seemed to search the very bottom of the profound gulf; but still I could make out nothing distinctly, on account of a thick mist in which everything there was enveloped, and over which there hung a magnificent rainbow, like that narrow and tottering bridge which Mussulmen say is the only pathway between Time and Eternity. This mist, or spray, was no doubt occasioned by the clashing of the great walls of the funnel, as they all met together at the bottom — but the yell that went up to the Heavens from out of that mist, I dare not attempt to describe.

“Our first slide into the abyss itself, from the belt of foam above, had carried us to a great distance down the slope; but our farther descent was by no means proportionate. Round and round we swept — not with any uniform movement — but in dizzying swings and jerks, that sent us sometimes only a few hundred yards — sometimes nearly the complete circuit of the whirl. Our progress downward, at each revolution, was slow, but very perceptible.

“Looking about me upon the wide waste of liquid ebony on which we were thus borne, I perceived that our boat was not the only object in the embrace of the whirl. Both above and below us were visible fragments of vessels, large masses of building timber and trunks of trees, with many smaller articles, such as pieces of house furniture, broken boxes, barrels and staves. I have already described the unnatural curiosity which had taken the place of my original terrors. It appeared to grow upon me as I drew nearer and nearer to my dreadful doom. I now began to watch, with a strange interest, the numerous things that floated in our company. I *must* have been delirious — for I even sought *amusement* in speculating upon the relative velocities of their several descents towards the foam below. ‘This fir tree,’ I found myself at one time saying, ‘will certainly be the next thing that takes the awful plunge and disappears,’ — and then I was disappointed to find that the wreck of a Dutch merchant ship overtook it and went down before. At length, after making several guesses of this nature, and being deceived in all — this fact — the fact of my invariable miscalculation — set me upon a train of reflection that made my limbs again tremble, and my heart beat heavily once more.

“It was not a new terror that thus affected me, but the dawn of a more exciting hope. This hope arose partly from memory, and partly from present observation. I called to mind the great variety



of buoyant matter that strewed the coast of Lofoden, having been absorbed and then thrown forth by the Moskoe-ström. By far the greater number of the articles were shattered in the most extraordinary way — so chafed and roughened as to have the appearance of being stuck full of splinters — but then I distinctly recollected that there were *some* of them which were not disfigured at all. Now I could not account for this difference except by supposing that the roughened fragments were the only ones which had been *completely absorbed* — that the others had entered the whirl at so late a period of the tide, or, from some reason, had descended so slowly after entering, that they did not reach the bottom before the turn of the flood came, or, of the ebb, as the case might be. I conceived it possible, in either instance, that they might thus be whirled up again to the level of the ocean, without undergoing the fate of those which had been drawn in more early or absorbed more rapidly.' (Pp. 172-5.)

He thereupon lashes himself to a water-cask near him, cuts it from the counter, and precipitates himself into the sea. The barrel, with its occupant, is returned by gradual gyrations to the surface of the sea, and the man is saved!

Although we cannot, as we have said, afford space for the entire transcript of 'The Purloined Letter,' we may venture to present a passage or two, showing with what perseverance and care the Parisian police are supposed to carry on a search when a large reward is in prospect.

A lady of the highest rank, it seems, has lost a letter, which, if given up to her husband, would compromise her reputation. The thief is the Minister D., who holds the thing *in terrorem* over her. The prefect of police is employed to regain it, and an enormous sum offered for its recovery. After failing in his efforts, he consults a certain M. Auguste Dupin, who requires to know the particulars of the search already made. They were as follows: —

"Why the fact is, we took our time, and we searched *every where*. I have had long experience in these affairs. I took the entire building, room by room; devoting the nights of a whole week to each. We examined, first, the furniture of each apartment. We opened every possible drawer; and I presume you know that, to a properly trained police agent, such a thing as a *secret* drawer is impossible. Any man is a dolt who permits a 'secret' drawer to escape him in a search of this kind. The thing is *so plain*. There is a certain amount of bulk — of space — to be accounted for in every cabinet. Then we have accurate rules. The fiftieth part of a line could not escape us. After the cabinets we took the chairs. The cushions we probed with the fine long needles you have seen me employ. From the tables we removed the tops."

"Why so?"

"Sometimes the top of a table, or other similarly arranged piece

of furniture, is removed by the person wishing to conceal an article ; then the leg is excavated, the article deposited within the cavity, and the top replaced. The bottoms and tops of bedposts are employed in the same way."

"But could not the cavity be detected by sounding?" I asked.

"By no means, if, when the article is deposited, a sufficient wadding of cotton be placed around it. Besides, in our case, we were obliged to proceed without noise."

"But you could not have removed — you could not have taken to pieces, *all* articles of furniture in which it would have been possible to make a deposit in the manner you mention. A letter may be compressed into a thin spiral roll, not differing much in shape or bulk from a large knitting-needle, and in this form it might be inserted into the rung of a chair, for example. You did not take to pieces all the chairs?"

"Certainly not; but we did better — we examined the rungs of every chair in the hotel, and, indeed, the jointings of every description of furniture, by the aid of a most powerful microscope. Had there been any traces of recent disturbance we should not have failed to detect it instantly. A single grain of gimlet-dust, for example, would have been as obvious as an apple. Any disorder in the glueing — any unusual gaping in the joints — would have sufficed to insure detection."

"I presume you looked to the mirrors, between the boards and the plates, and you probed the beds and the bed-clothes, as well as the curtains and carpets."

"That of course; and when we had absolutely completed every particle of the furniture in this way, then we examined the house itself. We divided its entire surface into compartments, which we numbered, so that none might be missed; then we scrutinized each individual square inch throughout the premises, including the two houses immediately adjoining, with the microscope, as before."

"The two houses adjoining!" I exclaimed; "you must have had a great deal of trouble."

"We had; but the reward offered is prodigious."

"You include the *grounds* about the houses?"

"All the grounds are paved with brick. They gave us comparatively little trouble. We examined the moss between the bricks, and found it undisturbed."

"You looked among D ——'s papers, of course, and into the books of the library?"

"Certainly; we opened every package and parcel; we not only opened every book, but we turned over every leaf in each volume; not contenting ourselves with a mere shake, according to the fashion of some of our police officers. We also measured the thickness of every book-cover, with the most accurate admeasurement, and applied to each the most jealous scrutiny of the microscope. Had any of the bindings been recently meddled with, it would have been utterly impossible that the fact should have escaped observation.

Some five or six volumes, just from the hands of the binder, we carefully probed, longitudinally, with the needles."

"You explored the floors beneath the carpets?"

"Beyond doubt. We removed every carpet, and examined the boards with the microscope."

"And the paper on the walls?"

"Yes."

"You looked into the cellars?"

"We did." (Pp. 267-9.)

Dupin advises him to make a re-search of the premises, and at the same time asks for an accurate description of the lost letter. The prefect makes the second search as advised, but returns unsuccessful. 'Did you offer a reward?' is the inquiry. 'Yes, the reward offered was *very* liberal.' In fact, the object to be attained was so great that the prefect would himself give 50,000 francs for the letter. 'In that case,' replies Dupin, opening a drawer and producing his cheque-book, 'you may as well fill me up a cheque, and I will hand you the letter;' and the exchange is made between the parties accordingly.

Dupin is asked, by the astonished prefect, to account for his success. In the first instance, when consulted by the prefect, he had suggested — 'Perhaps it is the very simplicity of the thing which puts you at fault,' but he had been ridiculed for so absurd a supposition. 'What nonsense you talk?' the prefect had observed. Yet Dupin proves to be right.

Knowing the Minister D——, it appeared that M. Dupin had called at his hotel, and, upon the pretext of weak eyes, assumed a pair of green spectacles, in order to conceal the inquisitive survey which he proposed to make of the apartments. He first examined a writing-table, with letters and papers upon it, near which the minister sate.

"At length my eyes, in going the circuit of the room, fell upon a trumpery fillagree card-rack of pasteboard, that hung dangling by a dirty blue ribbon, from a little brass knob just beneath the middle of the mantel-piece. In this rack, which had three or four compartments, were five or six visiting cards and a solitary letter. This last was much soiled and crumpled. It was torn nearly in two, across the middle — as if a design, in the first instance, to tear it entirely up as worthless, had been altered, or stayed, in the second. It had a large black seal, bearing the D—— cipher *very* conspicuously, and was addressed, in a diminutive female hand, to D——, the minister, himself. It was thrust carelessly, and even, as it seemed, contemptuously, into one of the uppermost divisions of the

No sooner had I glanced at this letter, than I concluded it to be that of which I was in search. To be sure, it was, to all appearance, radically different from the one of which the prefect had read us so

minute a description. Here the seal was large and black, with the D— cipher; there it was small and red, with the ducal arms of the S— family. Here, the address, to the Minister, was diminutive and feminine; there the superscription, to a certain royal personage, was markedly bold and decided; the size alone formed a point of correspondence. But, then, the *radicalness* of these differences, which was excessive; the dirt; the soiled and torn condition of the paper, so inconsistent with the *true* methodical habits of D—, and so suggestive of a design to delude the beholder into an idea of the worthlessness of the document; these things, together with the hyperobtrusive situation of this document, full in view of every visitor, and thus exactly in accordance with the conclusions to which I had previously arrived; these things, I say, were strongly corroborative of suspicion, in one who came with the intention to suspect.

“I protracted my visit as long as possible, and while I maintained a most animated discussion with the Minister, upon a topic which I knew well had never failed to interest and excite him, I kept my attention really riveted upon the letter. In this examination, I committed to memory its external appearance and arrangement in the rack; and also felt, at length, upon a discovery which set at rest whatever trivial doubt I might have entertained. In scrutinizing the edges of the paper, I observed them to be more *chafed* than seemed necessary. They presented the *broken* appearance which is manifested when a stiff paper, having been once folded and pressed with a folder, is refolded in a reversed direction, in the same creases or edges which had formed the original fold. This discovery was sufficient. It was clear to me that the letter had been turned, as a glove, inside out, re-directed, and re-sealed. I bade the minister good morning, and took my departure at once, leaving a gold snuff-box upon the table.” (Pp. 278, 279.)

He goes home, prepares carefully a *fac-simile* of the letter, and returns next morning for his snuff-box. During the gossip which ensues upon his visit, a loud report of fire-arms, accompanied by screams, is heard underneath the minister's window. That functionary throws up the sash for a moment to ascertain the cause of the disturbance, and during this interval Dupin exchanges his *fac-simile* for the original letter so ardently desired. The man who fires the pistol is a colleague of Dupin.— The reasoning upon which Dupin proceeds in this matter must be sought for in the tale itself.

We had marked, as worthy of extract, a short story, entitled ‘The Cask of Amontillado;’ but we are obliged to content ourselves with merely recommending it to the reader's notice. The tenor of it is as follows:— A man, owing to some previous slight or insult, entertains the most implacable hatred towards another. During the Carnival (for the scene is laid in Italy), he insinuates himself into the society of his victim, who is a

great amateur of rare wines, and inflames his imagination so much by the description of a certain matchless cask of Amontillado, that the other is induced to visit the subterranean cellar, in order to taste it. They (the two) proceed there accordingly; the tempter in some ordinary carnival disguise; the doomed man in the motley grotesque dress of a Fool or Zany, with the usual cap and bells. All things having been prepared beforehand, the amateur is induced to drink, glass after glass, until he becomes intoxicated and stupid. In this state, the other proceeds to build him up, in a recess in the wall. His task is almost done; and he is just about to fix the last stone in its place, when the poor drunkard shakes his fool's bells, and utters a single half-conscious cry of alarm. The murderer, staggered by the sound, hesitates for a moment, — only a moment, — and then completes his diabolical task; "shuts up his enemy alive in his grave, and returns to the upper air and society. He is oppressed, however, by remorse, which never leaves him till he dies. The helpless cry of the stupified victim, and the clash of his bells — a terrible incident in the murderous gloom of the scene — will ring for a long time (unless we mistake) in the reader's memory.

The poetical works of the author need not detain us long. With one remarkable exception, his verses do not differ materially from others of the same time. They are neither very good nor very bad. They do not exhibit much depth or graphic power, and but little tenderness — nor do they, in fact, possess any of those distinguishing qualities which lift a man up beyond his contemporaries. The blank verse is not good; but some of the smaller pieces have a smoothness and liquid flow that are pleasant enough. One short poem, said to have been written at the age of fourteen, and addressed 'To Helen,' is full of promise.

Of all Mr. Poe's poems, however, 'The Raven' is by far the first. It is, like the larger part of the author's writings, of a gloomy cast; but its merit is great; and it ranks in that rare and remarkable class of productions which suffice *singly* to make a reputation. Whether or not it was manufactured in the deliberate way stated by the writer in his article on 'The Philosophy of Composition,' we do not know; but the passage in which he dissects with anatomical precision what might otherwise pass for the offspring of impulse and of genius, is curiously characteristic of his analytical disposition. The poem itself, however, deserves to be remembered by all lovers of verse. In the United States its popularity is universal, but we believe it still to be far less known in this country than it ought to be. We therefore transcribe the greater portion of it.

'Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,  
 Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore—  
 While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,  
 As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door.  
 "'Tis some visitor," I muttered, "tapping at my chamber door—  
 Only this and nothing more."

'Ah, distinctly I remember it was in the bleak December,  
 And each separate dying ember wrought its ghost upon the floor.  
 Eagerly I wished the morrow;—vainly I had sought to borrow  
 From my books surcease of sorrow—sorrow for the lost Lenore—  
 For the rare and radiant maiden whom the angels name Lenore—  
 Nameless here for evermore.

'And the silken sad uncertain rustling of each purple curtain  
 Thrilled me—filled me with fantastic terrors never felt before;  
 So that now, to still the beating of my heart, I stood repeating  
 "'Tis some visitor entreating entrance at my chamber door—  
 Some late visitor entreating entrance at my chamber door;  
 This it is and nothing more."

'Open here I flung the shutter, when, with many a flirt and flutter,  
 In there stepped a stately Raven of the saintly days of yore.  
 Not the least obeisance made he; not a minute stopped or stayed he;  
 But, with mien of lord or lady, perched above my chamber door—  
 Perched upon a bust of Pallas just above my chamber door—  
 Perched, and sate, and nothing more.

'Then this ebony bird beguiling my sad fancy into smiling,  
 By the grave and stern decorum of the countenance it wore,  
 "Though thy crest be shorn and shaven, thou," I said, "art sure no  
 craven,  
 Ghastly grim and ancient Raven wandering from the Nightly shore—  
 Tell me what thy lordly name is on the Night's Plutonian shore!"  
 Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore."

'Much I marvelled this ungainly fowl to hear discourse so plainly,  
 Though its answer little meaning—little relevancy bore;  
 For we cannot help agreeing that no living human being  
 Ever yet was blessed with seeing bird above his chamber door—  
 Bird or beast upon the sculptured bust above his chamber door,  
 With such name as "Nevermore."

'But the Raven, sitting lonely on that placid bust, spoke only  
 That one word, as if his soul in that one word he did outpour.  
 Nothing further then he uttered; not a feather then he fluttered—  
 Till I scarcely more than muttered "Other friends have flown before—  
 On the morrow he will leave me, as my Hopes have flown before."  
 Then the bird said, "Nevermore."

'Startled at the stillness broken by reply so aptly spoken,  
 "Doubtless," said I, "what it utters is its only stock and store  
 Caught from some unfhappy master whom unmerciful Disaster  
 Followed fast and followed faster till his songs one burden bore—  
 Till the dirges of his Hope that melancholy burden bore—  
 Of 'Never—nevermore.'"

'But the Raven still beguiling all my sad soul into smiling,  
 Straight I wheeled a cushioned seat in front of bird and bust and  
 door;  
 Then, upon the velvet sinking, I betook myself to linking  
 Fancy unto fancy, thinking what this ominous bird of yore—  
 What this grim, ungainly, ghastly, gaunt, and ominous bird of yore  
 Meant in croaking "Nevermore."

This I sat engaged in guessing, but no syllable expressing  
 To the fowl whose fiery eyes now burned into my bosom's core;  
 This and more I sat divining, with my head at ease reclining  
 On the cushion's velvet lining that the lamp-light gloated o'er,—  
 But whose velvet violet lining with the lamp-light gloating o'er  
 She shall press, ah, nevermore!

'Then, methought, the air grew denser, perfumed from an unseen  
 censer  
 Swung by Seraphim whose foot-falls tinkled on the tufted floor.  
 "Wretch," I cried, "thy God hath lent thee—by these angels he hath  
 sent thee  
 Respite—respite and nepenthe from thy memories of Lenore!  
 Quaff, oh quaff this kind nepenthe and forget this lost Lenore!"  
 Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore."

'"Prophet!" said I, "thing of evil!—prophet still, if bird or devil!—  
 Whether Tempter sent, or whether tempest tossed thee here ashore,  
 Desolate yet all undaunted, on this desert land enchanted—  
 On this home by Horror haunted—tell me truly, I implore—  
 Is there—~~is~~ is there balm in Gilead?—tell me—tell me, I implore!"  
 Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore."

'"Prophet!" said I, "thing of evil—prophet still, if bird or devil!  
 By that Heaven that bends above us—by that God we both adore—  
 Tell this soul with sorrow laden if, within the distant Aidenn,  
 It shall clasp a sainted maiden whom the angels name Lenore—  
 Clasp a rare and radiant maiden whom the angels name Lenore."  
 Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore."

'"Be that word our sign of parting, bird or fiend!" I shrieked, up-  
 starting—  
 "Get thee back into the tempest and the Night's Plutonian shore!  
 Leave no black plume as a token of that lie thy soul hath spoken!  
 Leave my loneliness unbroken!—quit the bust above my door!  
 Take thy beak from out my heart, and take thy form from off my  
 door!"

• Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore."

'And the Raven, never flitting, still is sitting, still is sitting  
On the pallid bust of Pallas just above my chamber door;  
And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon's that is dreaming;  
And the lamp-light o'er him streaming throws his shadow on the  
floor;  
And my soul from out that shadow that lies floating on the floor  
Shall be lifted—nevermore!'

We do not propose to enter into the accuracy of the numerous investigations which Mr. Poe appears to have instituted into the publications of his brother and sister authors. To say the truth, we do not estimate his powers as a critic very highly. His essays on Criticism were, we imagine, written on the spur of the moment, without much consideration, and were more than sufficiently imbued with those prejudices with which he was so apt, we are told, to view the works of contemporary writers. Some of his essays are very slight and brief; some flippant; some distinguishable for that remarkable power of analysis which he carried into all his productions. His review of 'Barnaby Rudge,' in the third volume of this collection, is an extraordinary instance of his subtle and discriminating research into the very elements of fiction. It is impossible to trace out with greater nicety the very germ of a plot, and the finest artifices of invention. But here the interest of Edgar Poe's criticisms stops: few of them enter into the question of the peculiar genius of the author reviewed, of the class to which he belongs, of the way in which education and events have moulded him, of his habits or every day life, or of those impulses or physical circumstances which have impelled his intellect to assume that particular shape in which it presents itself before the world.

Without entering into some such considerations, the critic can scarcely place his author fairly on his pedestal. We feel, even in the case of Mr. Poe, that it would have been most desirable if a fuller biography had accompanied his works. Honest and able, as far as it goes, and glancing upon the more prominent events of his life, it leaves us without information on many matters from which much might have been gathered to form an accurate judgment. Perhaps we are, after all, copying the deformities only of the man, at a time when we are anxious to submit all that was good as well as bad to the reader's judgment. The roughnesses that were so conspicuous on the surface of Poe's character would naturally attract the notice of his biographers in the first instance. But, underneath, was there nothing to tell of?—no cheeriness in the boy—no casual acts of kindness—no adhesion to old friendships—



no sympathy with the poor or the unhappy, that might have been brought forward as indicative of his better nature? Even he himself has done nothing to help us. His sketches and stories are singularly deficient in all reference to his own private life. It is strange that a man who did and suffered so much should have left nothing for the historian's hands! The petty acts are indeed before us, but perhaps 'the greatest is behind.' For no man is thoroughly evil. There must be slumbering virtues — good intentions undeveloped, — even good actions, claiming to have a place on the record. Generosity, sympathy, charity have often their abodes in lowly and unexpected places — in poor, thoughtless, humble bosoms — in the hearts of those who have deeply sinned.

The influence of his faults was limited, and the penalty (such as it was) he only had to bear. But the pleasure arising from his writings has been shared by many thousand people. In speaking of himself personally, we have felt bound to express our opinions without any subterfuge. But we are not insensible that, whilst he grasped and pressed hardly on some individuals with one hand, with the other he scattered his gifts in abundance on the public. These gifts are by no means of a common order, and on balancing the account of the author with posterity, he ought to have credit for their full value.

Fortunately for Edgar Poe, his personal history will be less read, and will be more short-lived than his fictions, which will probably pass into many hands, unaccompanied by the narrative of his personal exploits. For one reader who carefully weighs the actions of an author's life, there are a hundred who plunge into the midst of his works without any previous inquiry. The sempstress revelling in 'The Mysteries of Udolpho' neither knows nor cares anything about the comfortable, domestic Mrs. Radcliffe. And the young man, intent on cheering his leisure hour with the adventures of Mrs. Amelia Booth, or Mr. Abraham Adams, has never heard perhaps that Henry Fielding (the noblest member of the house of Denbigh) was as often reduced to shifts as one of his own heroes, and that he died poor, and in a foreign land.

ART. VI.—*Speeches on Social and Political Subjects, with Historical Introductions.* By HENRY LORD BROUGHAM, F.R.S.  
2 vols. 12mo. London and Glasgow: 1857.

MANY are the claims of Lord Brougham upon the respect and gratitude of his countrymen; and many are the titles by which he will be known to posterity. As a philanthropist his name is imperishably associated with those of Clarkson and Wilberforce in their efforts for the suppression of the Slave trade, and he has given the chief impulse to the great cause of the Education of the people. As a statesman, he has taken a leading part in counselling and carrying some of the most important political measures of the nineteenth century. As an advocate whose zeal for his client scorned consideration of personal advancement, he will be known, if for nothing else, yet for his immortal defence of Queen Caroline. As a lawyer, his name is inscribed in the list of Lord High Chancellors of England,—and he bounded to that lofty dignity from the ranks of the Bar, without having previously filled one of the subordinate law offices of the Crown. As a legislator, the country owes to his perseverance some of the most important improvements in her civil laws, and we allude more especially to the radical changes that have been effected in the law of Evidence. He is not only a great speaker, but an able writer, as our own century of volumes will testify; not only a politician, who has fought like a gladiator for fifty years in the arena of party strife, but a man of letters, and a mathematician of no mean attainments. We remember when it was the fashion for those who cannot conceive the possibility of excellence in more than one department of knowledge, to sneer at Lord Brougham as ‘no lawyer.’ But this is best answered by the fact, that in hardly a single instance were his judgments in the Court of Chancery reversed on appeal by the House of Lords; and we will venture to say, that although there have been lawyers like Buller, and Holroyd, and Bayley and Littledale, more versed in the technicalities of their craft and the mysteries of special pleading—an abomination now well-nigh swept away,—few have been more profoundly imbued with the principles of the Common Law.

Rare, indeed, have been the examples of an intellect so vigorous and active. His energy throughout life has been astounding; and even now, at a period which in other men would be called old age, it shows little sign of diminution or decay. Mentally, his eye is not dim, nor his natural strength abated; for he still

prosecutes the cause of Law Reform with an ardour which might put to shame the efforts of younger men; and year after year he presses upon the Legislature measures of which the object is to simplify the machinery, and lessen to the suitor the costs of our courts of justice.

We do not intend to go over the wide field which a life so spent presents; but we propose in the present article to confine our attention to Lord Brougham as an Orator. It is by his speeches that his influence was most felt in the generation now fading from amongst us, and by them, more than anything else, his colossal reputation has been built. Although there is, unhappily, something evanescent in those great efforts of the human tongue which have so often roused and ruled the passions and the intellect of the senate and the nation, their results belong to history, and Lord Brougham will leave no monument behind him more worthy to be held in lasting remembrance than these Orations. For he has laboured to become a master in his art, and we see in the arrangement of his topics, the structure of his periods, and the choice of his language, the skill, and in its proper sense, the artifice, of the consummate rhetorician.

Upon the subject of oratory a lamentable misapprehension seems to prevail, and we are not sorry to have an opportunity of saying a few words about it. No one can deny that eloquence at the Bar and in Parliament is just now at a low ebb. It is often positively painful to enter a court of justice and hear the addresses to which juries are condemned to listen, from men who occupy the place where once stood an Erskine and a Brougham. No doubt there have been of late years brilliant exceptions, but we do not hesitate to say, that the general character of forensic oratory at the present day is far below what might be expected from the education, the opportunities, and the intellectual vigour of the age.

Nor is the state of things much better in the House of Commons. We do not of course expect that a country gentleman should be a good speaker because he has carried the county; nor that merchants or railway directors should study Demosthenes in their counting-houses, and come forth as orators as soon as they have been returned for a borough; but how few of the practised debaters of the House ever rise to anything which approaches to the name of oratory, how few are able to realise the idea of one whom Cicero describes: *qui jure non solum disertus sed etiam eloquens dici possit!* It has indeed been the custom of late to decry oratorical powers, as tending rather to dazzle and mislead than instruct and edify; and to praise the

dull dry harangue of the plodding man of business, who crams down the throat of his audience a heap of statistical facts, and then wonders to find them gaping or asleep, rather than the brilliant speech of the accomplished orator, who enlivens his subject with the sallies of wit, and adorns it with the graces of imagery. But this kind of language proceeds more from mortified incapacity than approving judgment. Hobbes defined a republic to be an aristocracy of orators, interrupted at times by the monarchy of a single orator; and in a country like this, where the very highest rewards and the proudest position are the prizes open to successful eloquence, it may well be matter of wonder that the number of competitors is so small in the race where 'that immortal garland is to be won, not without dust and heat.'

And what is the reason of this? It arises, we believe, chiefly from the fact that men will not believe that Oratory is an art, and that excellence in this, as in every other art, can only be attained by labour and by the study of the best models. To such an extent is this heresy carried, that it is actually considered a disparagement—a thing almost to be ashamed of—to be suspected of preparing a speech beforehand; and it is thought a recommendation of himself by an honourable member when, on rising to address the House, he declares that on entering it he had not the slightest intention of doing so. As if a man ever will or can speak well who takes no pains to make himself a proficient in the art, and who fancies that, like Dogberry's reading and writing, oratory comes by nature! The speaker must learn his craft as much as a painter or sculptor, or musician; although, like them also, he must have from nature some special aptitude for his vocation. If common sense did not tell us this, the great examples of antiquity would prove it. Every schoolboy knows the enormous pains that Demosthenes and Cicero took to qualify themselves for the task of addressing their fellow-citizens; and that some of the most celebrated orations that have come down to us from Athens and Rome were written for delivery, but actually never spoken at all.\* Very different from the common practice has been, if we mistake not, Lord Brougham's conception of the work of the

---

\* This subject has been illustrated by Lord Brougham himself, with his usual felicity, in some of his former contributions to this Journal, especially in the *Essays on the Greek, Roman, English, and French Orators*, now republished in the seventh volume of the Glasgow edition of his works, and in his '*Dissertation on the Eloquence of the Ancients.*'

future orator. He has furnished abundant evidence of his familiarity with the classic models. He has shown his veneration for Demosthenes by translating the Chersonese Oration and the great Oration on the Crown; and on more than one occasion he is said to have committed to writing beforehand the finest parts of his own speeches. If this be true, we honour him the more for the homage he has paid to the eternal rule, that without such *'improbis labor,'* excellence in any art is denied to man. And he has had his reward. He stands confessedly in the front rank of English orators, and he won his spurs at a time when the conflict was with giants.

At the present moment it will hardly be contested that the standard of oratory is far higher in the House of Lords than in the other House of Parliament; and if any one were asked to point out the best speakers in that august body he would name without hesitation, Lord Brougham, Lord Lyndhurst, the Earl of Derby, and the Earl of Ellenborough. We hope that before long Lord Macaulay will be added to the list, but he has not yet made a display of his great oratorical powers in the assembly to which he has been elevated, and which by his presence he adorns. Of Lord Lyndhurst's power as a debater it is impossible to speak too highly. But although at times, and in some passages, his speeches may be called eloquent, they want the rushing force — the declamatory vehemence — which is an essential element of oratory. Admirable in logic, comprehensive in statement, and faultless in diction, Lord Lyndhurst commands the attention of all who listen to him. But he appeals more to the reason than the feelings or the passions of his audience, and seeks to convince rather than to persuade. His discourse flows on like the waters of some calm majestic river unruffled by the wind; but we hear nothing of the dash of the torrent or the roar of the cataract; — there are no startling apostrophes, nor soul-stirring appeals, which, in the proud consciousness of his argumentative power, he seems almost to disdain. Certainly this cannot be said of Lord Derby, who, with a command of language as perfect as Lord Lyndhurst's, has a fire and a brilliancy peculiarly his own; but we should be disposed to place Lord Ellenborough at least on an equality with either of these eminent speakers, since he combines the exquisite precision of language of the one, with the force and animation of the other.

But great as these men are in debate, none of them can be said to rank as orators with Lord Brougham. If we were obliged to characterise his oratory, by a single word, it would be *Energy* — the *Δυστονη* of the Greeks. Cicero tells us that often

when he rose to speak he trembled in every limb. We doubt whether this ever happened to Lord Brougham. But the Roman orator had by nature a weak and nervous constitution, and this may account for the timidity of a character which, although on a memorable occasion he could thunder forth — *Contempsit Catilinæ gladios, non pertimescam tuos* — caused him, in the strife of contending factions, painfully to oscillate between his regard for Pompey and his fear of Cæsar. With an athletic frame Lord Brougham possesses a mental organisation singularly robust; and his style of speaking is cast in a corresponding mould. It is the furthest possible removed from the *exercitatio domestica et umbratilis*, and is rather that which rushes *medium in agmen, in pulverem, in clamorem, in castrum, atque in aciem forensem*. The following passage breathes not only the force of the orator, but the character of the man. It is from his speech in the House of Lords in 1838, on the emancipation of Negro apprentices:—

‘I have read with astonishment, and I repel with scorn, the insinuation that I had acted the part of an advocate, and that some of my statements were coloured to serve a cause. How dares any man so to accuse me? How dares any one, skulking under a fictitious name, to launch his slanderous imputations from his covert? I come forward in my own person. I make the charge in the face of day. I drag the criminal to trial. I openly call down justice on his head. I defy his attacks. I defy his defenders. I challenge investigation. How dares any concealed adversary to charge me as an advocate speaking from a brief, and misrepresenting the facts to serve a purpose? But the absurdity of this charge even outstrips its malice.’

Lord Brougham’s voice is not musical; at times, in its higher tones, it is harsh and hoarse, and sounds like the scream of the northern eagle swooping down upon its prey; but he possesses the art of modulating it with admirable effect, and his elocution is not less cultivated than his diction. His power over the English language is wonderful. It was said of him on one occasion that he made it bend under him. We do not assert that the word chosen is not sometimes too strong. We will not affirm that he does not sometimes sin against a fastidious taste. We cannot deny that in ransacking his memory for epithets and synonyms,—or perhaps we should say polyonyms,—he brings up some that are too vehement, and that in his descriptions of persons and measures there is too much tendency to exaggerate. But his vocabulary is inexhaustible, and his faults are those of amplitude of power. He runs riot in the exuberance of strength. His periods are often declamatory, but there are no platitudes; and without declamation, in its proper sense, there is no oratory.

It would be easy to point out in Demosthenes — still easier in Cicero — passages which, to the colder feelings of our western clime, seem overstrained and hyperbolic. But the criterion is this: How did they act upon the crowds that listened? Did they, or did they not, stir up from its innermost depths the soul of the auditory? For it must never be forgotten that the great end of oratory is to persuade, and by carrying captive the passions, to attack through them the citadel of reason. It will be found, on a careful study of Lord Brougham's speeches, that the declamation almost always assists the argument; it advances, so to speak, the action of the drama, and never, as is the case when it becomes mere tinsel or bombast in the hands of inferior men, impedes and encumbers it. He is fond of iterating an idea, and clothing it in every imaginable form of words — piling Ossa on Pelion — and making each sentence rise in the scale of impressiveness. Some of his periods may be too long, and there is a danger lest the attention of the hearer — or perhaps we ought now to say the reader — should flag while pausing for the climax of the sentence; but there is no false grammar — no anacoluthon — no confusion of metaphor, and out of the longest sentence or succession of sentences, he winds himself with unerring accuracy.

He himself said in one of his speeches — that on the administration of justice in Ireland in 1839, when defending himself from the charge of violence and undue severity made against him by Lord Melbourne — ‘No man is a judge of the exact force and weight of his own expressions.’ Probably Lord Brougham has at times been hardly conscious of the force of the projectile he has launched from his lips in the ardour of debate. He reminds us of Polyphemus hurling rocks as if he were a boy flinging pebbles. Thus, speaking in 1823 of the Notes of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, with reference to the state of Spain in 1822–3, he said —

‘I will venture to say that to produce anything more preposterous, more absurd, more extravagant, better calculated to excite a mingled feeling of disgust and derision, would baffle any chancery or state-paper office in Europe.’

And again —

‘Monstrous and insolent and utterly unbearable as all of them are, I consider that of Russia to be more monstrous, more insolent, and more prodigiously beyond endurance than the rest.’

So also, speaking of the conduct of the Whigs on the Bed-chamber question in 1839 —

‘This is the novel, the uncouth, the portentous, the monstrous

description of our free and popular constitution, which the Whig Government of 1839 has given to the Reformed Parliament of England.'

That careful preparation of an elaborate speech does not unfit an orator for unpremeditated and effective reply, has been shown by Lord Brougham in some of his finest displays. We will mention one remarkable example. It is the speech delivered by him on the instant without a moment's notice, in answer to the charges brought by the late Sir Robert (then Mr.) Peel, in 1819, against the Education Committee, of which Mr. Brougham had been chairman. It is a masterly effort, full of the keenest sarcasm and most cutting point—and from a note at the end we learn that its preservation is owing to the accident of a barrister who took an interest in the subject, happening to be in the gallery of the House of Commons; for 'the newspapers, for some days before this debate took place, had refrained from reporting Mr. Brougham's speeches in consequence, as it is said, of some offence given by him to a reporter 'in the form of words used in referring to him.' The following passage from this reply is a good illustration of the speaker's peculiar style—heaping sentence upon sentence, and stretching his topic until the tension becomes almost too great to be borne.

'But if I do not now satisfy all who hear me that the Committee were right, that this House was right, and the Right Honourable Gentleman wrong—if I do not succeed in proving to the heart's content of every one man of common candour and ordinary understanding, that the Right Honourable Gentleman is utterly wrong in all his charges—wrong from the beginning to the end of his laboured oration—if I do not in a few minutes and by referring to a few plain matters strip that performance of all claim to credit—if I do not show him to be mistaken in his facts, out in his dates, at fault in his law, ignorant of all parliamentary precedent and practice, grossly uninformed, perhaps misinformed, upon the whole question which in an evil hour he has undertaken to handle, with no better help than the practical knowledge and discretion of those who have urged *him* on to the assault, while they showed only a vicarious prodigality of their own persons—then I will consent to suffer—what shall I say?—to endure whatever punishment the Right Honourable Gentleman may think fit to inflict upon me and my colleagues—even the weight of his censure—which will assuredly in his estimation be fully equal to our demerits, how great soever they may be. But I venture to hope that the House, mercifully regarding my situation while such a judgment is suspending, will allow me, ere the awful decree goes forth, to avert, if it be possible, from our devoted heads a fate so overwhelming.'

Sarcastic irony, of which only a light touch appears in the



latter part of the above extract, is a favourite weapon of Lord Brougham. Sometimes he has indulged in it even to the verge of indiscretion; as, for instance, in the following passage, from his speech in defence of Queen Caroline, addressed, be it remembered, to the House of Lords, who were sitting in judgment upon her fate. But he doubtless knew how far he might venture to go in upbraiding while he affected to praise.

'This was when he was examined on the Tuesday. On the Friday, with the interval of two days, — and your Lordships, for reasons best known to yourselves, but which must have been bottomed on justice guided by wisdom, — wisdom never more seen or better evidenced than in varying the course of conduct and adapting to new circumstances the actions we perform — wisdom which will not, if it be perfect in its kind and absolute in its degree, ever sustain any loss by the deviation — for this reason alone, in order that injustice might not be done (for what in one case may be injurious to a defendant, may be expected mainly to assist a defendant in another,) — your Lordships, not with a view to injure the Queen — your Lordships, with a view to farther not to frustrate the ends of justice — allowed the evidence to be printed, which afforded to the witnesses, if they wished it, means of mending and improving upon their testimony.'

And this reminds us of another passage in the same speech, where, flinging irony aside, he with unparalleled boldness charged the Peers of England, before whom he stood as the advocate of the Queen, with having themselves, by their own conduct, forced her to associate abroad with persons beneath her, and thus incur the degradation of which she was then accused.

'But who,' he asked, 'are they that bring this charge, and above all before whom do they urge it? Others may accuse her — others may blame her for going abroad — others may tell tales of the consequences of living among Italians, and of not associating with the women of her country or of her adopted country; but it is not your Lordships that have any right to say so. It is not you, my Lords, that can fling this stone at Her Majesty. You are the last persons in the world — you who now presume to judge her, are the last persons in the world so to charge her; for you are the witnesses whom she must call to vindicate her from that charge. You are the last persons who can so charge her; for you being her witnesses, have been the instigators of that only admitted crime. While she was here she courteously opened the doors of her palace to the families of your Lordships. She graciously condescended to mix herself in the habits of most familiar life with those virtuous and distinguished persons. . . . But when changes took place — when other views opened — when that power was to be retained which she had been made the instrument of grasping — when that lust of power and place was to be continued its gratification, to the first gratification of which she had been made the victim, — then her doors were opened in vain; then that society of the Peeresses of England was withheld from her; then

she was reduced to the alternative, humiliating indeed . . . . either to acknowledge that you had deserted her . . . . or to leave the country and have recourse to other society inferior to yours.'

Our limits will not allow us to attempt an analysis of this celebrated speech, and indeed, it is too well known to need that we should do so. All who have read it must have stamped upon their memories the way in which Mr. Brougham shattered the evidence in support of the bill, and the irresistible force with which he insisted upon its rejection, not only on account of the worthlessness of the witnesses who were called, but the absence of the witnesses who were not. In anticipation of the taunt which might be expected from those who would say that he might call the latter himself, he burst forth:—

“And if you do not call them”—in the name of justice, what? Say!—Say!—For shame, in this temple—this highest temple of justice, to have her most sacred rights so profaned, that I am to be condemned in the plenitude of proof, if guilt is; that I am to be condemned, unless I run counter to the presumption which bears away in all Courts of Justice, that I am innocent until I am proved guilty; and that my case is to be considered as utterly ruined, unless I call my adversary's witnesses! Oh most monstrous! most incredible! My Lords! my Lords! if you mean ever to show the face of those symbols by which Justice is known to your country, without making them stand an eternal condemnation of yourselves, I call upon you instantly to dismiss this case, and for this single reason; and I will say not another word upon this subject.’

It was in the same speech that he uttered his well-known description of the duties of an advocate.

‘I once before took occasion to remind your Lordships—which was unnecessary, but there are many whom it may be necessary to remind—that an advocate, by the sacred duty which he owes to his client, knows in the discharging that office but one person in the world, THAT CLIENT AND NONE OTHER. To save that client by all expedient means—to protect that client at all hazards and costs to all others, and among others to himself—is the highest and most unquestioned of his duties; and he must not regard the alarm—the suffering—the torment—the destruction—which he may bring upon another. Nay, separating even the duties of a patriot from those of an advocate, and casting them, if need be, to the wind, he must prove reckless of the consequences, if his fate should unhappily be to involve his country in confusion for his client's protection!’

This, if considered as propounding an article in the code of forensic ethics, is an exaggerated and erroneous view, against which the right reason of every one instinctively revolts; but the speaker meant it to apply to and foreshadow the necessity to which he might be driven of recriminating upon the King.

and impugning his title to the throne in consequence of his marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert. Although Mr. Brougham did not go so far as this, yet he went far enough in vindicating his claim to know in the discharge of his duty to his client 'but one person in the world, that client and no other,' when he called the King 'the ringleader of the band of perjured witnesses;' and in quoting an affectionate letter from George III. to his daughter-in-law, said, that he could not read it 'without a feeling of sorrow, when we reflect upon the reign that has passed, and compare it with the rule we live under.'

It is needless to express any opinion upon the merits of the case, or to revive a controversy, in every aspect most unhappy, which has died away. We are dealing with the Queen's trial merely as it afforded a great occasion for a great advocate; and no one can deny the matchless skill with which the defence was conducted, and the power with which the testimony of Majocchi, the '*non mi ricordo*' Majocchi—of Demont, 'the Machiavel of waiting maids'—of Cucchi, with 'that unmatched physiognomy, those gloating eyes, that sniffing nose, that lecherous mouth'—of Sacchi, and of Kress, and indeed of all the witnesses for the bill, was sifted, anatomised, and destroyed. We will quote the peroration of the speech, and chiefly for the purpose of calling attention to the rising climax at the beginning.

'Such, my Lords, is the case now before you! Such is the evidence in support of this measure—evidence inadequate to prove a debt—impotent to deprive of a civil right—ridiculous to convict of the lowest offence—scandalous if brought forward to support a charge of the highest nature which the law knows—monstrous to ruin the honour, to blast the name, of an English Queen! What shall I say, then, if this is the proof by which an act of legislation, a parliamentary sentence, an *ex post facto* law, is sought to be passed against this defenceless woman? My Lords, I pray you to pause. I do earnestly beseech you to take heed! You are standing upon the brink of a precipice—then beware! It will go forth your judgment, if sentence shall go against the Queen. But it will be the only judgment you ever pronounced, which, instead of reaching its object, will return and bound back upon those who give it. Save the country, my Lords, from the horrors of this catastrophe—save yourselves from this peril—rescue that country of which you are the ornaments, but in which you can flourish no longer, when severed from the people, than the blossom when cut off from the roots and stem of the tree. Save that country that you may continue to adorn it—save the Crown which is in jeopardy—the Aristocracy which is shaken—save the Altar which must stagger with the blow that rends its kindred Throne! You have said, my Lords, you have willed—the Church and the King have willed—that the Queen should be deprived of its solemn

service. She has, instead of that solemnity, the heartfelt prayers of the people. She wants no prayers of mine. But I do here pour forth my humble supplications at the Throne of Mercy, that that mercy may be poured down upon the people, in a larger measure than the merits of their rulers may deserve, and that your hearts may be turned to justice.'

In connexion with the Queen's trial another opportunity was afforded to Mr. Brougham for a great oratorical display. When she died in August, 1821, the bells of most of the churches throughout England were tolled, — but those of Durham remained silent. Neither church nor cathedral there paid this tribute of respect to her memory; and a Mr. Williams, the editor of a local newspaper at Durham, commented with some severity upon the omission. What he wrote would now-a-days pass unheeded and disregarded, but those were times of *ex-officio* informations; and the late Lord Abinger, then Mr. Scarlett, the Attorney-General of the County Palatine, obtained a rule, which was afterwards made absolute, for a criminal information against John Williams, the publisher of the paragraph, for a libel against 'the clergy residing in and near the city of 'Durham.' We more than doubt whether such a body—having no corporate character or capacity — could, in point of law, be the possible subjects of a *libel*, so as to enable them to be the relators in a criminal information. But the rule was granted, and Williams was defended before a Durham jury by Mr. Brougham.

In the alleged libel occurred the following passage:— 'Yet these men profess to be followers of Jesus Christ, to walk in his footsteps, to teach his precepts, to inculcate his spirit, to promote harmony, charity, and Christian love! Out upon such hypocrisy!'—and Mr. Scarlett, who conducted the prosecution, had suggested in his opening address to the jury that the reason why the bells of Durham were silent was because the clergy there too deeply sympathised with the Queen's fate to give open expression to their sorrow. This was indeed to expose an unguarded flank to the enemy and invite a terrible attack, and thus did Mr. Brougham avail himself of the opportunity.

'The venerable the clergy of Durham, I am told, now for the first time . . . did nevertheless, in reality, all the while, deeply sympathise with her suffering in the bottom of their reverend hearts! When all the resources of the most ingenious cruelty hurried her to a fate without parallel— if not so clamorous as others, they did not feel the least of all the members of the community — their grief was in truth too deep for utterance — sorrow clung round their bosoms,

weighed upon their tongues, stifled every sound — and when all the rest of mankind, of all sects and of all nations, freely gave vent to the feelings of our common nature, THEIR silence, the contrast which THEY displayed to the rest of their species, proceeded from the greater depth of their affliction; they said the less because they felt the more! — Oh! talk of hypocrisy after this! most consummate of all the hypocrites! After instructing your chosen official advocate to stand forward with such a defence — such an exposition of your motives — to dare to utter the word hypocrisy, and complain of those who charged you with it! This is indeed to insult common sense, and outrage the feelings of the whole human race! If you were hypocrites before, you were downright frank honest hypocrites to what you have made yourselves — and surely for all you have ever done or ever been charged with, your worst enemies must be satiated with the humiliation of this day, its just atonement and ample retribution!

In the same speech occurs a passage which we must cite as perfect in its kind. Mr. Scarlett had lamented in his opening that the clergy had not the power of defending themselves through the public press. Mr. Brougham declared that they had largely used it and ‘scurrilously and foully libelled’ the defendant. He then thus proceeded: —

‘Not that they wound deeply or injure much; but that is no fault of theirs: without hurting they give trouble and discomfort. The insect brought into life by corruption, and nestled in filth, though its flight be lowly and its sting puny, can swarm and buzz and irritate the skin and offend the nostril, and altogether give us nearly as much annoyance as the wasp, whose nobler nature it aspires to emulate. These reverend slanderers — these pious backbiters — devoid of force to wield the sword, snatch the dagger; and destitute of wit to point or to barb it, and make it rankle in the wound, steep it in venom to make it fester in the scratch.’

Nor was this the last occasion on which Lord Brougham defended the memory of the Queen. No one can doubt the sincerity of his conviction of her innocence, and he has seized every opportunity of proclaiming it to the world. In a debate in 1823, on the question of the Administration of the Law in Ireland, brought forward by himself, Mr. Peel had censured his reference to a letter which had been addressed by the Irish Attorney-General, Mr. Saurin, to Lord Norbury, then Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in Ireland, and in which the writer had suggested that Lord Norbury should make use of his position as a judge on circuit to influence those with whom he came in contact against Catholic Emancipation. This letter was a private one, which had got into print by some improper means, contrary to the wish and intention of Mr.

Saurin, and had been the subject of much public remark. On hearing the attack, Mr. Brougham turned to Mr. Denman and Mr. Williams, who with Dr. Lushington had been his colleagues on the Queen's trial, and, quoting Cromwell's words at the battle of Dunbar, said, 'The Lord hath delivered them into our hands.' When he rose to reply he thus dealt with the accusation, and thus retorted upon his adversary : —

'And why, let me ask, am I to be blamed for simply referring to an extensively published letter, as if I had first given it publicity? . . . I entirely agree with the Right Honourable Gentleman, in his condemnation of those who have been concerned in obtaining the letter for the purpose of publishing it. Their conduct may not be criminal by the enactments of the law, but it is morally dishonest, and it is revolting to every honourable feeling. I go heartily along with him in reprobating all such odious practices; I hold with him that it is shameful, indecent, abominable to encourage them; I consider it truly detestable to hold out the encouragement of bribes for the purpose of corrupting servants, and inducing them to violate their first duty, and betray the secrets of their master—aye, and of their mistress too! — I say of their mistress?—of their mistress!—and not only to betray her secrets and to steal her papers, and to purloin her letters, but to produce them for the treacherous, the foul, the execrable purpose of supporting a charge against her honour and her life, founded on the documents that have been pilfered by her servants and sold to her enemies! the proofs obtained by perfidy suborned, and larceny perpetrated! and then to carry on a prosecution wholly grounded on matter drawn from sources so polluted, as at once insulted, disgraced, and degraded the nation — a prosecution so foul, so utterly abominable, making the sun shroud himself in darkness, as if unwilling to lend the light of day to the perpetration of such enormous wickedness! \* And by whom was this infamy enacted? By the Ministers of the Crown — by the very colleagues of the Right Honourable Gentleman who now pronounces so solemn a denunciation of all that tends to encourage servants in betraying the confidence of their masters and their mistresses!'

Lord Brougham is sparing in the use of metaphor, and hardly ever resorts to a simile. But when he does employ metaphor it is always apt and effective. We may give as a specimen his description of the benefits conferred by the Reform Bill, which occurs in a speech delivered by him in 1839, on what was called the Bedchamber Question, so fatal to Sir Robert Peel's attempt to form an Administration in the month of May in that year.

---

\* An eclipse of the sun happened to take place at the time of the opening of the case for the Bill of Pains and Penalties against the Queen.

‘It is my clear and deliberate conviction (and if I had not so believed I never would have consented to the change in 1831 and 1832, much less promoted it)—that if the altered Constitution is fit for the calm, it is yet better suited to the tempest; if the vessel can ride the more safely in smooth water, since the repairs she then underwent, they were still more necessary for enabling her to bear the storm. Her being made more tight in her rigging, better trimmed, better manned, and by a more contented crew, sounder in her timbers, more secure and more seaworthy in all her fabric, far from rendering her less fit safely to ride through the troubled waters, must make her more powerful to defy the strife of the elements . . . . The vessel has undergone a thorough repair; not unnecessary for her security in the fairest weather, but in the stress of wind and wave absolutely required to give her a chance of safety.’

And, although it is not included in the collection we are reviewing, we cannot resist the temptation of quoting an extract from his noble speech on the State of the Law, where a fine metaphor is beautifully sustained.

‘The great stream of Time is perpetually flowing on; all things around us are in ceaseless motion; and we vainly imagine to preserve our relative position among them by getting out of the current and standing stock-still on the margin. The stately vessel we belong to glides down; our bark is attached to it; we might “pursue the triumph and partake the gale;” but worse than the fool who stares expecting the current to flow down and run out, we exclaim, “Stop the boat!” and would tear it away to strand it for the purpose of preserving its connexion with the vessel.’

It is, however, in the power of description that Lord Brougham peculiarly excels. No one can paint with more force a picture in words. Witness that tremendous passage with which he appalled the House of Lords when, in his speech on the Slave Trade in 1838, he described the horrors of the Middle Passage and spoke of the shark that follows in the wake of the slave-ship; ‘and her course is literally to be tracked through the ocean by the blood of the murdered, with which her enormous crime stains its waters.’ Our space will not allow us to do more than give a fragment of the picture in which are drawn scenes—

Scenes not exceeded in horror by the forms with which the great Tuscan poet peopled the Hell of his fancy, nor by the dismal tints of his illustrious countryman’s pencil breathing its horrors over the vaults of the Sistine Chapel! *Mortua quin etiam jungebat corpora vivis!* On the deck and in the loathsome hold are to be seen the living chained to the dead—the putrid carcase remaining to mock the survivor with a spectacle that to him presents no terrors—to mock him with the spectacle of a release that he envies! Nay, women have been known to bring forth the miserable fruit of the womb, sur-

rounded by the dying and the dead — the decayed corpses of their fellow victims.’

After this, his affecting account of the sufferings of the people in his speech against the Orders in Council in 1812 seems almost tame. And yet his tale of starving penury and silent woe in the manufacturing districts was told with infinite skill — we fear with not more skill than truth — and touched the hearts of all who heard it. Speaking of Birmingham he asked : —

‘In what state do you find that once busy hive of men? Silent, still, and desolate during half the week; during the rest of it, miserably toiling at reduced wages, for a pittance scarcely sufficient to maintain animal life in the lowest state of comfort, and at all times swarming with unhappy persons, willing, anxious to work for their lives, but unable to find employment. He must have a stout heart within him, who can view such a scene, and not shudder. But even this is not all . . . . A third would say that he was afraid to see his people, because he had no longer the means of giving them work, and he knew that they would flock around him and implore to be employed at the lowest wages: for something wholly insufficient to feed them. “Indeed,” said one, “our situation is greatly to be pitied; it is most distressing; and God only knows what will become of us, for it is most unhappy!”’

He possesses also an unrivalled fertility in strong and apposite illustration. This is one of the most effective ornaments of a speech, vividly condensing the argument and bringing it home at once to the apprehension. We will give one or two examples. Alluding to the pressure of misery caused by the Orders in Council, and the wild ideas that were afloat of the relief that was likely to flow from the proposed abolition of the East India Company’s trading monopoly, — when one district, which raised no earthly produce but black horned cattle, had petitioned for a free exportation to the East Indies — and ‘the ancient and respectable city of Newcastle, which grows nothing but pit coal, had earnestly entreated that it might be allowed to ship that useful article to supply the stoves and hot-houses of Calcutta,’ he said : —

‘They remind one of the accounts which have been handed down to us of the great pestilence which once visited this city. Nothing in the story of that awful time is more affecting than the picture which it presents of the vain efforts made to seek relief. Miserable men might be seen rushing forth into the streets and wildly grasping the first passenger they met, to implore his help, as if by communicating the poison to others they could restore health to their own yeins, or life to its victims whom they had left stretched before it. In that dismal period there was no end of projects and nostrums for



preventing or curing the disease; and numberless empirics every day started up with some new delusion, rapidly made fortunes of the hopes and terrors of the multitude, and then as speedily disappeared, or were themselves borne down by the general destroyer. Meanwhile the malady raged until its force was spent; the attempts to cure it were doubtless all baffled; but the eagerness with which men hailed each successive contrivance, proved too plainly how vast was their terror and how universal the suffering that prevailed.'

And again, in the same speech, in answer to the question, what had the Orders in Council to do with the scarcity arising from a deficient crop? —

'Why, Sir, to deny that those measures affect the scarcity, is as absurd as it would be to deny that our Jesuits' Bark Bill exasperated the misery of the French hospitals, for that the wretches there died of the ague and not of the bill. True, they died of the ague; but your murderous policy withheld from them that kindly herb which the Providence that mysteriously inflicted the disease, mercifully bestowed for the relief of suffering humanity.'

Throughout these orations occur from time to time magnificent bursts of the finest eloquence, and our only difficulty is to make a selection. We might quote from his speech in 1812, at the Liverpool Election, his invective against the policy of Mr. Pitt. 'Immortal in the triumphs of our enemies and the ruin of our allies, the costly purchase of so much blood and treasure! Immortal in the afflictions of England and the humiliation of her friends, through the whole results of his twenty years' reign, from the first rays of favour with which a delighted Court gilded his early apostacy, to the deadly glare which is at this instant cast upon his name by the burning metropolis of our last ally!'<sup>\*</sup> We might also quote from his speech on the Army Estimates in 1816,—a speech which we are told by himself had a greater success than any other made by him in Parliament—his comparison of France in 1792, when 'a prodigious revolution had unchained twenty-six millions of men in the heart of Europe,' with France at the time he spoke, after 'Jacobinism,' itself arrested by the Directory, punished 'by the Consuls, reclaimed by the Emperor, has become attached to the cause of good order, and made to serve it with the zeal, the resources and the address of a malefactor engaged by the police after the time of his sentence had expired.' Or the peroration of his speech in 1823, on abuses in the Administration of the Law in Ireland, which Mr. Wil-

---

<sup>\*</sup> The news of the burning of Moscow had arrived in Liverpool by that day's post.

berforce in his 'Diary' (see his 'Life,' vol. v. p. 186.) called 'quite 'thundering—magnificent, but very unjust declamation.' With the justice or injustice of the attack we are not now concerned, but it is melancholy to think that such a theme should have afforded materials for a long oration in the House of Commons little more than thirty years ago, and that it should have been possible to say there, as Mr. Brougham did say, 'In England, justice is delayed, but, thank Heaven, it can never be sold. In Ireland it is sold to the rich, refused to the poor, delayed to all. It is in vain to disguise the fact; it is in vain to shun the disclosure of the truth. . . . . We are driving six millions of people to despair, to madness. . . . .'

But at the risk of choosing a passage which some may think eclipsed by others more rhetorical and brilliant, we will give an extract from the close of his speech in the House of Commons in 1830 on Negro Slavery, which we think remarkably fine:—

'Tell me not of rights — talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right — I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings of our common nature, rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim! There is a law above all the enactments of human codes — the same throughout the world, the same in all times — such as it was before the daring genius of Columbus pierced the night of ages, and opened to one world the sources of power, wealth, and knowledge; to another, all unutterable woes. Such it is at this day. It is the law written in the heart of man by the finger of his Maker; and by that law, unchangeable and eternal, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they will reject the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man! \* In vain you appeal to treaties, to covenants between nations: the covenants of the Almighty, whether of the old Covenant or the new, denounce such unholy pretensions.'

With this it is worth while to compare his grand and impassioned burst of indignant eloquence, when denouncing in the House of Lords, in 1838, the cruelties practised in our West India

---

\* Some years ago, when a case was argued before Lord Denman and several other judges in Serjeants' Inn, involving incidentally the right of a Spanish or Portuguese vessel to carry slaves, the counsel who argued that a certain capture was unlawful, was assuming that, by the Law of Nations, slave-trading was lawful; upon which Lord Denman said, 'I don't know that; I should like to hear that point argued.' However, it was soon shown that what the laws of the principal nations of Europe had sanctioned, could not be contrary to the Law of Nations; and indeed so Lord Stowell had decided in the case of the French vessel *Le Louis* in 1817.

Colonies, and calling upon the House to assent to the immediate emancipation of the Negro apprentices. Eleven female slaves had been severely flogged, and then forced by torture to work on the treadmill, 'till their sufferings had reached the pitch when 'life can no longer even glimmer in the socket of the weary 'frame.' They died — and

'Ask you,' said the great champion of the cause of African freedom. 'ask you, if crimes like these; murderous in their legal nature, as well as frightful in their aspect, passed unnoticed; if inquiry was neglected to be made respecting these deaths in a prison? No such thing! The forms of justice were, on this head, peremptory even in the West Indies; and those forms, the handmaids of Justice, were present, though their sacred mistress was far away. The coroner duly attended; his jury were regularly impannelled; eleven inquisitions were made in order, and eleven verdicts returned. Murder! manslaughter! misdemeanour! misconduct! No — but "Died by the Visitation of God!" Died by the visitation of God! A lie! a perjury! a blasphemy! The visitation of God! Yes, for it is amongst the most awful of those visitations by which the inscrutable purposes of His will are mysteriously accomplished, that He sometimes arms the wicked with power to oppress the guiltless; and if there be any visitation more dreadful than another — any which more tries the faith and vexes the reason of erring mortals, it is when Heaven showers down upon earth the plague — not of scorpions, or pestilence, or famine, or war — but of unjust judges and perjured jurors; wretches who pervert the law to wreak their personal vengeance, or compass their sordid ends, forswearing themselves upon the gospels of God, to the end that injustice may prevail and the innocent be destroyed!'

Lord Brougham is also a great master of the art of ridicule, which becomes in his hands a formidable weapon. He is obviously fond of it, and uses it often with marked effect. But we are bound to say that it is never ill-natured; there is no venom in the point. The wound may pain for the moment, but it never festers. And there is often an hilarity in the satirical attack which might make even the victim himself join in the laughter of which he is the object. When the Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon had sealed the Continent against the imports of British commerce, and we had tried to retaliate by the Orders in Council, which had the effect of stopping our American trade, and involving us in a quarrel with the United States, the Ministers advanced the argument that a substitute for our former market was found in our increasing trade with the Spanish and Portuguese colonies of South America. In point of fact, our *North American* trade had amounted to thirteen millions sterling a year — while the *South American* trade was only one million. By way of illustrating the importance and magnitude

of the commerce we had lost, Mr. Brougham drew an amusing picture of the raptures of joy into which Ministers would be thrown if they could command such a market anywhere on the Continent.

‘Why, Sir, only conceive an event which should give an opening in the north of Europe or the Mediterranean for but a small part of this vast bulk — some change or accident, by which a thirteenth, aye, or a thirtieth, of the enormous value of British goods could be thrown into the enemy’s countries! In what transports of delight would the new President [of the Board of Trade, Mr. Rose] be flung! I verily believe he would make but one step from his mansion to his office — all Dowling Street, and all Duke’s Place would be in an uproar of joy. Bless me, what a scene of activity and business should we see! what Cabinets — what Boards! — What amazing conferences of Lords of Trade! — What a driving together of Ministers! — What a rustling of small clerks! — What a mighty rushing of brokers! — Circulars to the manufacturing towns — harangues upon ‘Change, performed by eminent naval characters — triumphal processions of dollars and volunteers in St. James’ Square! — Hourly deputations from the merchants — courteous and pleasing answers from the Board — a speedy importation into Whitehall, to a large amount, of worthy knights representing the City — a quick return cargo of licenses and hints for cargoes — the whole craft and mystery of that license trade revived, with its appropriate perjuries and frauds — new life given to the drooping firms of dealers in forgery whom I formerly exposed to you — answered by corresponding activity in the Board of Trade, and its clerks — slips of the pen worth fifteen thousand pounds\* — judicious mistakes — well considered oversights — elaborate inadvertencies. — Why, so happily constituted is the Right Honourable Gentleman’s understanding, that his very blunders are more precious than the accuracies of other men; and it is no metaphor, but a literal mercantile proposition to say, that it is better worth our while to err with him than to think rightly with the rest of mankind!’

In a review of Lord Brougham’s speeches, it would be unparadonable to omit mention of his great Oration on Parliamentary Reform — one of the most elaborate of all his efforts. But it is too well known to require more than a brief notice. Nothing but the highly-wrought state of public feeling could justify the scene at the close, when sinking on the ground beside the woolsack, the Lord Chancellor exclaimed, ‘By all you hold most dear — by all the ties that bind every one of us to our common order and our common country, I solemnly adjure you — I warn you — I implore you, — yea, *on my bended knees* I supplicate you — reject

---

\* Mr. Baring (afterwards Lord Ashburton) had stated in the House of Commons, that by two mistakes at one time, licenses were rendered so valuable, that he would have given that sum for them.

‘not this bill.’ This is too theatrical for good taste. It reminds us of the exaggerated manner of the Père Lacordaire in the French pulpit, or of some of the extravagant scenes which have occurred in the French revolutionary assemblies. But the genius of French oratory is essentially different from our own. Let us, however, not be understood to depreciate the eloquence of our neighbours, either in the pulpit or the tribune or at the bar. The country which has produced a Bossuet and a Massillon, — a D’Aguesseau, a Berryer, and a Guizot, may well contend with others for the palm of excellence in speech; and it is one of the most melancholy results of the suppression of liberty in France, that her orators are dumb, and that the force of a military despotism, or the restrictions of a jealous police, have crushed into silence the tribune which has been the scene of so many triumphs of eloquence and freedom. *Quousque tandem?*

The speech on Parliamentary Reform has several fine passages, but it is not, throughout, so eloquent as many others delivered by Lord Brougham. It is more in the nature of an exhaustive reply to the arguments that had been advanced in opposition to the bill by Lords Dudley, Winchelsea, Wharncliffe, Harrowby, and Caernarvon, and these were met and parried and retorted with admirable skill. The Earl of Caernarvon, in answer to the question, What Reform had the Opposition to offer if the proposed measure was rejected? had compared the Ministry to some host, who, having set before his guests an uneatable dinner with which they found fault, should ask them, ‘What dishes can you dress yourselves?’ — and thus Lord Brougham took up the illustration:—

‘My noble friend says that such an answer would be very unreasonable — for he asks, ingeniously enough, “how *can* the guests dress a dinner, especially when they have not possession of the kitchen?” But did it never strike him that the present is not the case of guests, called upon to eat a dinner — it is one of rival cooks, who want to get into our kitchen. We are here all on every side cooks, — a synod of cooks (to use Dr. Johnson’s phrase) and nothing but cooks; for it is the very condition of our being — the bond of our employment under a common master — that none of us shall ever taste the dishes we are now dressing. The Commons may taste it; but can the Lords? We have nothing to do but propose the viands. It is therefore of primary importance, when the authority of two classes of rival artists is the main question, to inquire what are our feats severally in our common calling.’

And in answer to the extreme and impossible case put by the Earl of Harrowby, of the population of an enfranchised borough of four thousand souls being all paupers, he said that he had a

right to put an extreme case on the other side, to illustrate the nature of representations under the rotten-borough system; and he instanced the case of the Nabob Wallajah Cawn Bahadur, who 'had actually his eighteen or twenty members bought with a price, and sent to look after his pecuniary interests as honest and independent members of Parliament.'

'Behold,' he said, 'the sovereign of the Carnatic, who regards nor land, nor rank, nor connexion, nor open country, nor populous city; but his eye fastens on the time-honoured relics of departed greatness and extinct population — the walls of Sarum and Gattón; he arms his right hand with venerable parchments, and pointing with his left to a heap of star pagodas, too massive to be carried along, lays siege to the citadel of the Constitution, the Commons' House of Parliament, and its gates fly open to receive his well-disciplined band.'

But our limits compel us to stop. We shall be glad if anything we have said has the effect of making these speeches more generally read. We advise all who wish to qualify themselves as public speakers to study the orations of Lord Brougham. They will find them a storehouse of manly thought, of vigorous argument, and lofty eloquence upon all the great questions of his time. Few may hope to rival the orator who defeated the bill of Pains and Penalties against Queen Caroline, and snapped asunder the chain of Slavery; but none can fail to profit by the example. But above all things, let no one imagine, that without taking pains and bestowing labour, he can rise to eminence as an Orator. He may be a fluent speaker and an expert debater, but an orator he will not be, if he refuses to copy the example and follow the precepts of the great masters of the art. And of all auxiliaries to the tongue, the pen is the best. Cicero tells us, that *stilus optimus et præstantissimus dicendi effector et magister*; and to use his own beautiful simile, the habit of writing passages in a speech will communicate aptness and force to extempore expression, just as the vessel retains her onward way from the impetus previously given, after the stroke of the oar has ceased. Let us, however, not be misunderstood. We by no means intend to advise a habit of writing out the whole of a speech, and getting it off by heart before it is delivered. Not only does this impose too great a load upon the memory, and render the chance of a break down almost inevitable, when, from sudden nervousness or any other cause, some passage which forms a necessary link in the chain is forgotten;—but it prevents a speaker from feeling, as it were, the pulse of his audience, and varying his style and tone according to the impression which he sees is made upon them. In most cases a written speech is a failure from this

cause. But the subject matter should be beforehand well and thoroughly digested;—there should be the *cogitatio et commentatio* insisted upon by Cicero; and in addition to this, with respect to particular passages, the *assidua ac diligens scriptura*. By this means the speaker will have, laid up in the arsenal of his memory, a supply of weapons ready for any emergency that may arise; and it is almost a truism to say, that sentences considered beforehand in the laboratory of thought, and submitted to criticism and revision by being embodied in written composition, must be more likely to be effective than those which are thrown off hastily in the hurry of debate, when there is no time to pause for the best and most appropriate expression. But, indeed, the habit of composition will have the effect of suggesting to the speaker, at all times, the best word and the best sentence; and will thus assist him whenever the necessity occurs for unpremeditated reply. Cicero amongst the ancients, and Lord Brougham amongst the moderns, have shown with what advantage familiarity with writing and practice in speaking mutually act and react upon each other.\*

In conclusion, we may add, that the value of this collection of Lord Brougham's speeches is enhanced by the historical introductions written by himself, and prefixed to several of them, explaining the occasions on which they were delivered, and the subjects to which they refer. The style of these introductions is excellent—clear, vigorous, and correct—and they are in themselves a very useful contribution to the history of the nineteenth century.

---

\* We cannot take leave of the subject of oratory without a passing allusion to the highly important labours and discoveries of Mr. Churchill Babington, which have enabled him recently to recover from Egyptian papyri in the British Museum copious fragments of no less than three of the Orations of Hyperides. The last of these discoveries is the long lost famous *επιταφιος* of this orator, being the funeral discourse over Leosthenes and his comrades in the Lamian War, which has just been published with the munificent assistance of the Royal Society of Literature. This work is a real addition to the known remains of Greek oratory, for it puts us almost entirely in possession of another of the most celebrated orations of antiquity.

ART. VII. — *History of Civilization in England*. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Vol. I. London: 1857.

MR. BUCKLE'S Introduction to the 'History of Civilization in England' is nearly the first attempt which has been made in this country to treat of History as a Science. The phrase is so smooth, that it may be used without a due appreciation of its full meaning, though that meaning is at once very definite and very important.

We may be said to understand a subject scientifically, when we can make such general statements about it as will enable us, by the ordinary processes of logic, to solve any of the particular questions presented by its details, by showing how its different members are related to each other, and to the rest of the subject. The opposite of science is empiricism, which consists in an acquaintance with a number of isolated facts, unsupported by any knowledge of the relations between them. We all know empirically that the days are long in summer and short in winter, but those only can be said to understand this fact scientifically, who can show the place which it occupies in the general relations of the solar system. A scientific view of history, therefore, would be one which would show how and why all human affairs have happened as they did and not otherwise; and inasmuch as every department of human action, thought, and feeling, stands in some kind of relation to every other, the Science of History would only be complete when all human thoughts and actions had their proper places assigned to them, and when their relations to all the rest are clearly marked out. The method of arriving at this result must be to deduce, from the observation of a sufficient number of details, certain abstract formulas, which, when applied to particular cases, would enable the historical observer to predict events as the astronomical observer predicts eclipses. Whenever all the necessary formulas have been ascertained and arranged in a systematic form, exhibiting their connexion with each other, that system will form the Science of History, and the test of its accuracy will be the power of those who are skilled in it to trace out beforehand, upon proper data, the march of human affairs. It is universally admitted that the construction of this science, whether it be possible or not, is indefinitely remote. Mr. Buckle's object in dealing with it is twofold. He wishes, in the first place, to record and to justify his faith in its principles and prospects; and, in the second, to contribute (for no single man



can hope to do more) to its construction by eliciting from the history of England some of its leading principles, and by exemplifying their operation in the various events, intellectual, social, political and physical, which have occurred in this country since it first came into existence. This scheme, if it stood alone, would appear to most men too vast to be executed by any single mind, but when it is viewed in relation to Mr. Buckle's notions of completeness, its magnitude becomes bewildering and overpowering.

This 'General Introduction' consists of the announcement and illustration of the principles of the science ultimately to be applied to that enormous mass of matter which collectively constitutes what Mr. Buckle understands by English history. It will fill several volumes. The one just published contains 854 closely-printed 8vo. pages. Its materials have been collected from 496 different books, and yet it only constitutes about a third of the vestibule of the building which Mr. Buckle ultimately hopes to raise. The last 600 pages sketch, with extraordinary fulness and compression, some of the leading features of English and French civilisation; when at least two more volumes have performed the same office for Spain, Scotland, Germany, and America, the world will be in a position to enter upon the history of English civilisation itself. Unhappily, the construction of so gigantic a plan shows a misconception of the capacity of the human intellect and the length of human life. A very simple rule of three sum might convince Mr. Buckle (if he were open to conviction) that the chance that his work will be a mere Cyclopean ruin is incalculably great. Parr or Jenkins might possibly have achieved it by a lifetime's devotion; but we greatly fear that Mr. Buckle's epitaph will be '*magnis excidit ausis.*'

Mr. Buckle begins by discussing the question whether a science of history is possible; and he says that the opinion that it is, is opposed by a common notion that 'in the affairs of men there is something mysterious and providential which makes them impervious to our investigations, and which will always hide from us their future course.' 'This doctrine,' he says, 'is gratuitous' and 'incapable of proof;' and he also contends that it can be shown, by positive evidence, that human actions are 'governed by fixed laws.' This positive evidence is derived from statistics, and Mr. Buckle refers to several facts established by that means in illustration of its character. The first fact is, that 'murder is committed with as much regularity, and bears as uniform a relation to certain known circumstances, as do the movements of the tides, and the relations of the seasons.' And

the others establish similar conclusions with respect to accusations of crime, to the number of suicides, of marriages, and even of misdirected letters in the Post Office. In order to complete the refutation of the view opposed to his own, Mr. Buckle attempts to account for the origin of the doctrines of Free Will on the one hand, and Predestination on the other, each of which he considers inconsistent with his own system. He looks upon both as theological. The earliest doctrine upon the nature of events is the doctrine of Chance; and this he supposes prevailed originally amongst nomad tribes of hunters and fishermen. Gradually agriculture taught men to see various uniformities in nature, whence they rose by degrees to the conception of the necessary connexion of events, and these two theories suggested to the earliest theologians the doctrine of Free Will on the one side, and that of Predestination on the other. Predestination he considers to be at best 'a barren hypothesis,' as it lies beyond the province of our knowledge. He also objects that its advocates impute injustice to God. Free Will, on the other hand, rests, as he informs us, 'on the metaphysical dogma of the supremacy of the human consciousness;' but consciousness, he inclines to think, is only a state of mind, and not a faculty, and, whatever it is, is indisputably fallible. The theological views of the question are therefore alike untenable, and Mr. Buckle's conclusion is, 'that when we perform an action, we perform it in consequence of some motive or motives; that these motives are the results of some antecedents; and that, therefore, if we were acquainted with the whole of the antecedents, and with all the laws of their movements, we could, with unerring certainty, predict the whole of their immediate results.' There are two classes of antecedents,—those which are in, and those which are out of the mind; and if we could find out how each class acted on the other, we should understand all the vicissitudes of the human race. The great external agents are climate, food, soil, and the general aspect of nature; and under certain circumstances the action of these may be so powerful as to conquer and enslave the mind. Under other circumstances they may be conquered by it; and thus we have two types of civilisation which may be roughly described as the Asiatic and the European; in the first of which, nature is more important than man, whilst in the second, man is more important than nature.

In asserting these propositions, Mr. Buckle appears to us to have committed himself to a multitude of hasty generalisations, supported by a still greater multitude of facts, laboriously collected, but not always correctly stated or fairly applied. It

would be a hopeless task to follow him, within the limits we can devote to this subject; through the vast and varied researches indicated by his catalogue of authorities and his notes; but we feel bound to caution his readers against an implicit confidence in these statements; and we shall at once produce three examples, taken almost at random, of the inaccuracies we have detected.

In speaking of the effect of climate and soil on the habits of a people, Mr. Buckle remarks, that although Spain and Portugal on the one hand, and Sweden and Norway on the other, are countries essentially different in government, laws, religion, and manners, yet that these four countries have one great point in common, namely, that agriculture is interrupted by the heat and dryness of the weather in the former countries, and by the cold and shortness of the days in the latter. '*The consequence is, that these four nations, though so different in other respects, are all remarkable for a certain instability and feebleness of character, presenting a striking contrast to the more regular and settled habits which are established in countries where climate subjects the working classes to fewer interruptions.*' It is hardly necessary to point out to any one at all acquainted with the Peninsula or the north of Europe, that the alleged fact is as unfounded as the inference is absurd.

Among the causes affecting national character, Mr. Buckle reckons earthquakes, because 'there is reason to believe that they are always preceded by atmospheric changes which strike immediately at the nervous system, and these have a direct physical tendency to impair the intellectual powers'—and in Peru he mentions, as a highly curious fact, that 'every succeeding visitation increases the general dismay.' It is impossible that Mr. Buckle should not be aware that in countries subject to earthquakes, the usual apathy of man to every kind of habitual danger soon conquers his alarm; that the Peruvian builds his low dwelling expressly to resist the shock; and that the peasant of Southern Italy suffers no diminution of his intellectual faculties from the stroke which may be impending over him. But Mr. Buckle goes on to state, that 'earthquakes and volcanic eruptions are more frequent and more destructive in Italy and in the Spanish and Portuguese peninsula than in any other of the great countries.' Whence he infers, by a singular process of reasoning, that superstition is more rife, and the clergy more powerful; but that the fine arts flourish, poetry is cultivated, and the sciences neglected. Every link in this chain is more or less faulty. There is no volcano in the Spanish peninsula, and the only earthquake known to have occurred there was that of Lisbon. Spain has produced no sculptors, and her painters

are certainly, as a school, inferior to those of Flanders. Italy has never ceased to produce an illustrious band of men of science from Galileo to the present day. In short, the whole superstructure crumbles from the basis. }

Equally absurd is his attempted comparison between India and Greece, as if the condition of human life in the broad plains of Hindostan was 'oppressed by something great and terrible,' while the seaman or the mountaineer of Greece was 'encouraged' by the 'small and feeble' aspect of the country he was born in; and, therefore, became 'less appalled, less superstitious, and sought to investigate events with a boldness not to be expected in those other countries where *the pressure of nature* troubled 'his independence.' It is somewhat remarkable, that while Mr. Buckle adverts to the fabulous extravagance of the Hindoo mythology, and ridicules the distinctions of caste, he passes in silence over the astronomical discoveries of that remarkable people and the subtle provisions of their civil laws.

These examples may suffice to show the reliance which can be placed on Mr. Buckle's perception of truth in the ordinary records of history and geography, and they might be multiplied indefinitely. His learning is great, but his assertions are not indisputable. He dismisses altogether from consideration the facts connected with difference of race; yet, if the science of history is to be founded on the totality of human knowledge, surely no part of this inquiry deserves a more careful investigation.

Let us now revert, however, to the fundamental principles of his work, which it is our main intention to discuss. Mr. Buckle next observes that the measure of civilisation is the 'triumph of the mind over external agents;' and as in Europe this triumph has been very complete, the most important subject for the student of European history will be the study of the laws of the mental antecedents to which he had before referred. It is usual, he says, to attempt to perform this task by the help of metaphysics; that is to say, by each man's study of the operations of his own mind; but this method he considers to be unfruitful on account of 'the impossibility of taking a comprehensive view of the whole of the mental phenomena, because, however extensive such a view may be, it must exclude the state of the mind by which or in which the view itself is taken.' The only possibility of arriving at scientific knowledge upon these subjects lies, he thinks, in 'studying the mental phenomena, not simply as they appear in the mind of the individual observer, but as they appear in the actions of 'mankind at large.' As an illustration of the two methods in

question, he refers to the attempts which have been made to ascertain the proportion between male and female births. After the failure of many attempts to solve the question physiologically, it was discovered by statistics that the proportion was that of twenty-one male to twenty female births; and 'this method,' says Mr. Buckle, 'is obviously analogous to that by which I propose to investigate the operations of the human mind, while the old and unsuccessful method is analogous to that employed by the metaphysicians. As long as physiologists attempted to ascertain the laws of the proportion of sexes by individual experiments, they effected absolutely nothing towards the end they hoped to achieve. But when men became dissatisfied with these individual experiments, and instead of them began to collect observations less minute but more comprehensive, then it was that the great law of nature for which during many centuries they had vainly searched was first unfolded to their view.' By investigating human actions in their aggregate, and by directing his attention to the most important of their elements, Mr. Buckle hopes to contribute to the attainment of similar results. He says that 'a double movement, moral and intellectual, is essential to the very idea of civilisation, and includes the entire theory of human progress;' and he proceeds to consider which of the two is the more important. He gives the preference in this respect to the intellectual movement, upon the ground that all that is well ascertained in morals has long been known, and that, therefore, the force of morality is of a stationary nature. Men know now that certain things are wrong. They knew it a thousand years ago, and the knowledge has at present just as much or just as little tendency to prevent those acts as it had then. 'Moral principles affect nearly the whole of our actions; but we have incontrovertible proof that they produce not the least effect on mankind in the aggregate, or even on men in very large masses, provided that we take the precaution of studying social phenomena for a period sufficiently long, and on a scale sufficiently great, to enable the superior laws to come into uncontrolled operation.' Mr. Buckle next argues, that religion and literature are not the causes of civilisation, but its effects; and that Government, so far from having promoted, has retarded it, except in respect of the security which it has afforded to person and property. The conclusion is, that civilisation depends mainly upon intellectual movement, and that the laws of its progress can only be ascertained by studying the growth of knowledge. Having enunciated these principles, Mr. Buckle proceeds to apply, or perhaps to illustrate them, by investigating the influence of two tempers

of mind which he calls the protective spirit and scepticism on French and English history, from the middle of the 16th to the end of the 18th century; and he arrives at the conclusion, that the progress of civilisation varies directly as scepticism, and inversely as the protective spirit,—understanding those words not in the senses which common usage has affixed to them, but as denoting respectively a disposition to inquire, and a disposition to maintain without examination any form of established belief.

Such is a sketch, necessarily highly condensed, and therefore in some respects very imperfect, of the general doctrine of Mr. Buckle's book. It gives, we hope, a fair notion of the character of his argument, but it certainly affords a very imperfect view of his most characteristic merits. Even when we agree with him least, it is impossible not to admire the extraordinary ingenuity and the profusion of recondite information with which he supports his opinions, as well as the perspicuous and eloquent language in which he expresses them. We are anxious to acknowledge Mr. Buckle's merits in the fullest manner, because we shall address ourselves principally to points on which we differ from him; and it would be matter of deep concern if we allowed that circumstance to conceal our opinion that this is, as far as conception goes, one of the most remarkable philosophical works of the present generation, although in point of execution it must be termed unequal, heterogeneous, and paradoxical.

Great as Mr. Buckle's merits undoubtedly are, pain will, we think, be the first and the strongest impression left by it on most of his readers. Englishmen, in general, are startled and offended by speculations which appear to deny individual freedom, and to replace the variety which we all associate with life by something which, to many minds, seems a sort of living death. Distasteful, however, as his conclusions may be, it is neither their pleasantness nor their tendency, but their truth, which is at issue; and it is impossible to blame him for doing his utmost to establish this vital point, whatever may be its consequences. Intellectual cowardice is the only form of that vice which is at all common in this country, but it prevails to a lamentable degree. Most writers are so nervous about the tendencies of their books, and the social penalties of unorthodox opinion are so severe, and are exacted in so unsparing a manner, that philosophy, criticism, and science itself too often speak amongst us in ambiguous whispers what ought to be proclaimed from the house tops. There are many of Mr. Buckle's speculations with which we do not agree, but we admire the courage with which he propounds them. We must, however, condemn him for a certain

harsh and peremptory contempt for the feelings of his neighbours, which constantly impels him to throw his views into needlessly offensive shapes, and which prevents him, even when it would be quite possible to do so, from condescending to show their consistency with those elementary principles of morals and theology which are the most important of all beliefs.

It may be desirable to state at the outset the general nature of the observations which Mr. Buckle's book has suggested to us. We do not think that he has proved the fundamental proposition upon which his whole theory depends; namely, that a science of human action is possible. We do not think that if such a science were possible, that fact would (as Mr. Buckle appears to think) be fatal either to morality or to theology, or that it would involve their reconstruction. We are further of opinion that Mr. Buckle's conception of civilisation is false, especially in respect of the view which he takes of its relations to morality; and lastly, it seems to us that these defects in his system react most injuriously in several important respects on the views which he takes of concrete history. We shall abstain from entering upon questions of detail, and attempt to place our objections to his theory upon the broadest and most general grounds.

The dogma on which Mr. Buckle's whole theory rests is, that 'human actions are governed by fixed laws;' or, as he expresses it more fully, 'when we perform an action, we perform it in consequence of some motive or motives,' which motives are the result of some antecedents; and as he repudiates metaphysics, the evidence in favour of this assertion is entirely derived from statistics, by which the aggregate number of a vast variety of actions taking place in considerable periods of time in particular countries, is proved to be nearly constant from year to year. This result he considers to be inconsistent with the existence of free will. In order to refute 'those who believe that human actions depend more on the peculiarities of each individual than on the general state of society,' he first shows that the number of suicides which occur from year to year is almost constant, and ends by observing that 'all the evidence we possess respecting it points to one great conclusion, and can leave no doubt on our mind that suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect that which is a necessary consequence of preceding circumstances.'

Granting Mr. Buckle's premisses, which indeed are simply the statement of unquestionable matter-of-fact, we altogether deny his conclusion. We contend that the power of predicting

a general result is consistent with absolute inability to predict the behaviour of a particular person under given circumstances, and therefore with the existence of free will, even if free will implies irregularity of action. If free will exists at all, it cannot on any hypothesis introduce more confusion into statistical calculations than any other cause of action, of the operation and nature of which we are ignorant; but it is the very object of the science, to which Mr. Buckle refers to enable us to make general assertions about the effects of such causes, and it is the strangest perversion of its doctrines to infer from them that unknown causes do not exist. If the question whether one man should or should not murder another had to be decided by a throw of the dice, the uncertainty whether the murder would take place, would be quite as great as it could be if the question depended on free will. With respect to the dice, we can foretel to a nicety how many sixes and aces will be thrown in ten thousand throws, but we are absolutely unable to foretel what any particular throw will be, nor does our certainty as to the general result help us in the least degree to a conclusion as to the particular one. This is surely an exact parallel to the case of human action. We can foretel its aggregate, but we cannot foretel its individual results. The theory and the fact stand upon an entirely different footing. The one records, with numerical precision and distinctness, a certain process which goes on in our own minds, by which we estimate the extent of our expectations; the other is matter of observation; and though the two things run parallel to each other with most surprising accuracy, they are perfectly and essentially distinct, and there cannot be a greater error than to suppose that the theory exercises any sort of influence over the fact. All that any advocate of free will ever maintained is perfectly consistent with all the evidence which Mr. Buckle or M. Quetelet have produced. No statistical researches have ever proved more than that the aggregate results do not vary, and this leaves untouched the assertion that the particular result is not predictable.

Mr. Buckle appears to us to misapprehend the nature of the science to which he appeals when he uses such language as the following: 'In a given state of society a certain number of persons must put an end to their own life. This is the general law, and the special question as to who shall commit the crime depends *of course* upon special laws, which however in their total action must obey the large general law to which they are subordinate.' The 'of course' is obscure. It is ascertained that so many people have killed themselves annually for some



years past. From contemplating the uniformity of human action, Mr. Buckle expects that the same thing will happen in the present year, and his expectation is verified, and this result he calls a 'law,' but how does it tend to prove the existence of 'special laws'? If he could show that any special class of persons committed suicide, he might fairly use such an expression. But the existence of such 'special laws' is to be proved by observation, and is by no means to be inferred as a matter of course. To do so leads almost inevitably to a most serious practical error, of the nature of which we can hardly suppose that Mr. Buckle is ignorant, though he certainly appears to us to fall into it. This error consists in supposing that there is some kind of connexion between the different events which are included in a general formula, so that the fact that one or more of the events have happened, which according to the calculation ought to happen, affects the probability that the remaining events will happen or not. Nothing is so common as this mistake, and one of its most ordinary forms is that which is all but universal amongst gamblers. They can never dispossess themselves of the notion that the next throw of the dice, the next deal of the cards, depends, in some way or other, upon the last. At rouge et noir, for instance, the chances are as forty to thirty-nine in favour of the table, and any one who will go into the gambling rooms at Baden or Aix may see people noting the 'run of the luck,' as they call it, and putting their money on one square or another, according to the number of times that the black or the red has won consecutively. Mr. Buckle cannot require to be told that this is a mere superstition; that if the red had won ten times running, the chance in favour of the black (in the absence of cheating) would be just what it was at first, neither better nor worse; yet he falls himself, or appears to fall, into this shallow snare when he argues that individual acts must be predictable, because their aggregate results are predictable; when he infers as of course that because he has discovered one formula there must be numberless others to be discovered; or, as he describes it, that because the aggregate result is 'governed' by a general 'law,' the particular result must be 'governed' by a special 'law.'\*

---

\* Amongst the numerous authorities quoted by Mr. Buckle we do not find the '*Essai philosophique sur les Probabilités*' by Laplace. The whole subject is there discussed with consummate ability, and at p. 42-7. (ed. 1814) the reader will find the very same illustrations of his theory which Mr. Buckle has reproduced.

In writing upon a subject so delicate the greatest precision and clearness of language are necessary; and it is not a slight imputation on a writer of eminence that though his language leans to a very dangerous error, he does not expose its importance and its absurdity.\* He allows people to infer that in his opinion there is in the nature of things a provision for the suicide of about two hundred and forty persons annually in London, and that this 'law' is a curb to freedom; but he never calls their attention to the wild absurdity which is involved in supposing that the 'law' interferes with the liberty of individual action, or that it is any thing else than a numerical description of the state of expectation in the mind which conceives it. Yet we can hardly imagine a more extravagant proposition than that if a homeless girl leaps into the Thames she thereby diminishes the probability that a ruined merchant will blow out his brains. All that statistics prove is that it is possible at any given moment to foretel what will happen in the course of some definite period dated from that time, but they throw no light on the question of free will, unless indeed any one will contend that my freedom to kill a man to-day is hampered by the freedom of some one else to kill another man six months hence. If you have ten balls in a bag, and if you know beforehand that one of them is black, the chance that you will draw it out rises from nine to

---

\* We cannot say, though we are anxious to do Mr. Buckle full justice, that he appears to us to use language with adequate precision. In a passage quoted above, he refutes 'those who believe that human actions depend more on the peculiarities of each individual than on the general state of society.' Where is the opposition? surely the sum of the 'peculiarities of each individual' form a most important part of 'the general state of society.' What people do maintain is, that any one man's actions depend on his individual peculiarities, and that the sum of all men's actions depend on the sum of their individual peculiarities, and this Mr. Buckle does not and cannot refute; he confuses the matter by the vague words, 'human actions,' which may mean several things. So, too, he says, that murders are committed with 'as much regularity' as is found in the tides. In fact, the regularity is infinitely less. We can foretel to a minute the time of high water at London Bridge on a given day, but we can tell nothing about murder, unless we take a wide sweep of time, place, and country. Here the word misused is 'regularity.' By the 'regularity' of the tides it is meant that we can foretel how and when they will flow. In speaking of the 'regularity' of murder, Mr. Buckle means to assert a fact which he believes to be true respecting murders, — namely, that all particulars relating to men are capable of being foretold; but as yet that is not proved.

one to certainty at each successive trial *if the balls are not replaced*. If they are replaced, you may draw white balls for ever without altering the chance of drawing the black one on the next occasion. When statistics are applied prospectively, they are applied to an indefinitely large number of cases; and therefore they prove nothing whatever as to the freedom of individual action.

For these reasons Mr. Buckle's positive evidence in favour of his own view is inconclusive, nor can we speak more highly of his attempts to refute and to explain the origin of the doctrines which appear to him to be opposed to it. He thinks that the doctrines of chance and of the necessary connexion of events represent different stages of civilisation: that the first originated amongst hunters, whilst the second arose out of the habits of agriculture; and he thinks it highly probable that out of these doctrines 'have respectively arisen 'the subsequent dogmas of Free Will and Predestination.' The first observation which suggests itself here is, that this theory does not seem very consistent with the fact that the firmest believers in predestination are the nomadic Arabs, and the Turks, who were nomads when they adopted it. We do not, however, lay much stress upon this, because we should be inclined to doubt Mr. Buckle's second proposition as well as the first.

To the doctrine of Free Will Mr. Buckle objects that it rests upon the 'metaphysical dogma of the supremacy of the human 'consciousness,' and consciousness is probably a mere state of mind, and certainly 'extremely fallible;' and, as an instance, he cites the case of spectral appearances, to which, he says, the consciousness testifies, though their unreality is generally admitted. We shall consider elsewhere the true meaning of the word 'free;' for the present we will confine ourselves to the remark that Mr. Buckle appears to us to fail in the objections which he makes to the popular view. His argument is, that though consciousness may testify to the existence of liberty, it is not to be trusted. This would prove that no human testimony can be relied upon for any purpose, for no evidence is generically infallible. The senses are fallible; but if twenty people swore that they had seen a man walking down the Strand at a given time, and if their evidence was not only consistent in general, but also in a great variety of minute particulars; if one had seen him at Temple Bar, and others at a variety of intermediate points down to Charing Cross, and if their evidence was entirely independent, who could doubt its truth? The evidence upon the subject of Free Will is of this

kind, though it far exceeds it in degree. It is admitted that men generically resemble each other in their constitution on this point; and in every language, in every system of legislation, in all literature, there are innumerable recognitions, direct and indirect, express and implied, of the existence of something which every one describes as will and freedom. Though consciousness may not be infallible, it is inconceivable that it should be fallible to this extent. The united testimony of such an enormous number of witnesses cannot be set aside by general considerations about the infallibility of consciousness. It would be as reasonable to doubt the existence of St. Paul's cathedral on the general ground of the fallibility of the senses.\*

Whilst we regard Mr. Buckle's argument upon the questions which form the foundation of his book as inconclusive in the last degree, we must not be understood to deny the possibility of such a science as he wishes to found; but we think, in the first place, that its possibility is very questionable, and in the second, that if it is possible at all, its students will probably have to be content with very vague results, and will certainly be obliged to begin at a very different point from that which Mr. Buckle has chosen, and to take into account many considerations which he has neglected. History is nothing else than a record of various human actions, and these actions are on all hands admitted to depend, to a very great degree indeed, on the characters of those who perform them. No doubt an immensely wide experience shows a general similarity in the character of different men. All have the same desires, the same aversions, and the same powers, in a greater or less degree, but the different ways in which they are combined, are apparently infinite; and until we are able to predict what will be the character of particular people, it would seem hopeless to attempt to predict their actions. Mr. Buckle seems to think, that by attending to the general course of affairs, we may ultimately succeed in doing so; but this rests upon the supposition that all men come into the world, with the same characters,

---

\* Mr. Buckle tells us, in a note, that 'consciousness is infallible as to the fact of its testimony, but fallible as to its truth;' for that this can only be ascertained by the judgment, which is often wrong. This is surely equivalent to saying that consciousness is fallible upon subjects on which it offers no opinion. Consciousness, thinks Mr. Buckle—and we quite agree with him—reflects or presents to the mind certain phenomena. On these phenomena the judgment founds certain conclusions, which conclusions may or may not be true. The inference would seem to be, that the judgment is fallible, and not the consciousness.

and that circumstances alone produce the differences between them. The laws which govern the material world, and the causes of physical phenomena, are more or less discoverable by the human mind, because the tendency of analysis, and of its results, is to render the apprehension of those causes and laws more simple and direct. 'But the course of inquiry directed to human actions, or to that aggregate of human actions which is called history, is totally opposite to the course of inquiry of physical science. The moral relations of mankind, the motions of the mind determining certain actions, and the combinations of particular causes in the general result, are by their nature infinite, and the further they are traced the more intricate does their connexion become. To this objection Mr. Buckle replies by denying the effect of the moral feelings and passions on the average of human affairs, and by attempting to substitute for these principles of action certain physical phenomena which are utterly inadequate to the solution of the problem. And by a fair inference from this basis, his system appears to us to substitute for the moral government of the world by an infinite intelligence, capable of including within its universal orbit all the aberrations of individual freedom, a mere concourse of facts regulated by no definite intention, and directed to no moral end. The application of such a doctrine to the history of civilisation is obvious.

By such considerations as these we should be led to the conclusion, that the science of history, if it is possible at all, will in all probability always remain very incomplete, and that a vast variety of influences, lying beyond the range of observation, will always modify the conclusions at which its students may arrive. If, however, it is to become a science at all, we can feel no doubt that it must start from premisses which Mr. Buckle studiously passes over. For the reasons which we have already stated, he absolutely ignores metaphysics, and proposes to solve the problems to which metaphysicians address themselves, by looking at human conduct in the mass, instead of confining his views, as he contends metaphysicians always do, to the phenomena of a single mind; and he illustrates his mode of proceeding by a comparison which appears to us to afford so complete an analogy, that though we have alluded to it already, we will re-state it somewhat more fully. The metaphysician, he says, professes, 'by studying individual *'minds,'* to *'ascertain the laws which govern their movements.'* Similarly the physiologist professes, 'by studying individual *'bodies,'* and thus ascertaining the laws which regulate the *'union of the parents,'* to *'discover the proportion of the sexes,'*

‘because the proportion is merely the result to which the union ‘gives rise.’ Each inquirer has, he says, failed in his undertaking, but what the physiologist attempted has been performed by the statistician, who in counting the number of births, discovered that twenty-one boys were born for every twenty girls. It is true, he adds (p. 157.), that this ‘law’ still remains an empirical truth, ‘not having yet been connected with the physical ‘phenomena by which its operations are caused,’ but he contends that the discovery precisely illustrates the method by which he proposes to investigate human action in general. Nothing, we think, can be more true, and certainly nothing can expose more clearly, the defect under which his whole scheme labours. There is an ingenuity worthy of a special pleader, in the way in which Mr. Buckle states the question which the physiologists wished to determine. They wanted, he says, to discover *the proportion* between male and female births. If so, we can only say it was very foolish not to adopt the obvious expedient of counting them; but though we do not profess to vie with Mr. Buckle in special acquaintance with the subject, we strongly suspect from his own notes, that what the physiologists wished to discover, was not *the proportion* between male and female births, but the reason why any particular birth was male or female; and upon this subject, by his own admission, statistical inquiry has thrown hardly any light at all. Whenever the question is solved, it will be solved in terms of physiology. If we apply this illustration to the study of history, it would seem to show that though statistical observations, or observations conducted exclusively on the statistical plan, may serve as guides to further inquiry, any real science of human action must have for its foundation a sort of knowledge which may be called metaphysical, psychological, or ethical. Mr. Buckle objects that the only method of conducting such inquiries to a fruitful result is, ‘by observations so numerous as ‘to eliminate the disturbances; or by experiments so delicate as ‘to isolate the phenomena.’ The second method, he says, is impossible in metaphysical inquiry; and the first has been systematically neglected by metaphysicians; and hence he draws the conclusion, that in the study of human nature metaphysics must be laid out of account.\*

---

\* In a note he admits that a small number of metaphysicians have pursued the course suggested in the text, but it is a habit of Mr. Buckle’s to make admissions in notes which are not very reconcilable with the remarks to which they refer. Throughout the earlier chapters of this volume, Mr. Buckle expresses the greatest contempt,

It is, however, surely quite possible, that both these propositions may be true without involving this inference; for it may be, that if metaphysicians studied a sufficient number of examples as matters of fact, they would arrive at conclusions well worth having. For example, Mr. Buckle observes, that all metaphysical inquiries tend to the establishment of one or the other of two systems—idealism or nominalism. Might not this fact itself be taken into account in metaphysical inquiry, and might not a due attention to it throw great light on the ways in which men think? Indeed, though he professes to repudiate such inquiries, Mr. Buckle's results are only obtained by the help of psychological hypotheses. He tells us, for example, amongst his other averages, that the number of marriages in a year depends upon the price of corn; and this, he says, is statistically established. It so happens that in the same place (p. 24.), he informs us, that the number of persons accused of crime in France was for eighteen years about equal to the number of deaths of males registered in Paris; but he very properly treats this as being merely a curious coincidence. Why is this? Partly, no doubt, because in the case of the marriages not only a single similarity, but a correlative variation may be traced, but principally because there is a moral or psychological link in the one case, whilst there is none in the other. The link which connects the number of marriages with the price of corn is the moral element of prudence, which teaches men to indulge the wish to marry when corn is abundant and to restrain that desire when it is scarce, inasmuch as the general expenses of life commonly rise and fall with the price of corn; and thus we conjecture, with great probability, that whenever the supply of food increases, a larger number

---

on all occasions, for metaphysical researches and that philosophy which deals with the higher faculties of men, considered internally. This being the estimate formed by our author of this class of thinkers, we found with surprise, at p. 535., that Mr. Buckle places Descartes in the very first rank of the benefactors of mankind—and this expressly as the 'originator of that great system and method of metaphysics' which is inseparably connected with his fame. For, as every student of the Cartesian philosophy knows, it began and centred in metaphysics; or, as Mr. Buckle has it, 'the method of Descartes rests solely on the consciousness each man has of the operations of his own mind' (p. 535.). But Mr. Buckle had previously told us (p. 16.) that 'the uncertainty of the existence of consciousness as an independent faculty had long since convinced him that metaphysics will never be raised to a science by the ordinary method of observing individual minds.' What then becomes of that 'great system and method' of Descartes?

of people will be able to marry, and *vice versa*. On the contrary, we can hardly conceive of any amount of statistical evidence which could warrant us in believing that there is any sort of connexion between the number of persons accused of crime in France and the quantity of male deaths in Paris. If we found that they varied directly or inversely as each other, or that they bore any other constant relation, we should still look upon it as a strange coincidence and nothing more. We do not deny for a moment the immense value of statistics for a vast variety of purposes. We are quite ready to admit, that they may suggest an infinite number of curious and important inquiries upon human action, but we utterly disbelieve that without a scientific acquaintance with the functions and the constitution of the mind, gathered from the observation of individual minds, it will ever be possible to construct a real science of history. To attempt to draw metaphysical or psychological conclusions from statistical data is no more than an elaborate way of inquiring into the distance between one o'clock and London Bridge.

Whatever may be the truth as to the possibility of constructing such a science as Mr. Buckle proposes to found, and whatever may be the degree of accuracy of which, when founded, it may turn out to be susceptible, his speculations will interest his readers principally on account of the relation which they bear to morality and theology. The first impression which Mr. Buckle's book must convey to almost any reader is, that he must make his choice between morality and theology on the one hand, and social philosophy on the other; for that if the latter is possible, the former are absurd. We do not at all agree in this opinion. We do not believe that Mr. Buckle is, or need be, at issue with morals or with religion, though he often writes as if he were, and though the tone of his writing would go far to justify a doubt whether he would shrink from opposing both the one and the other. We think, on the contrary, that if the scheme which he propounds is possible at all—which, for reasons just given, we greatly doubt—it must either contradict itself, or it must include the subjects in question and maintain that they rest upon a rational foundation, for they are most important constituent parts of human action, and to explain human action as a whole is the very object which Mr. Buckle proposes to obtain. That he does not see, or at least does not explain this, seems to us to be a result of the mistake which vitiates the whole of his speculations—the mistake of taking statistics and not the study of the constitution of man—whether it be called ethics or psychology, for the starting point of his inquiries.



The point at which Mr. Buckle's theory is at issue with morals is, that he maintains that the 'actions of men are governed by fixed laws,' whereas morals depend on the supposition that they are determined by the free choice of the man himself, and these two propositions appear at first sight to exclude each other. We do not think that this is so, though Mr. Buckle puts the first proposition in a form which implies it. When he speaks of actions being 'governed by fixed laws,' all that he means is, that by using certain formulas it is possible to predict them. Human actions, he says, may be predicted, and upon this foundation he proceeds to use language which seems to ignore any kind of distinction between right and wrong, or, at any rate, any individual liability to praise or blame. For the sake of the argument we will concede the possibility of predicting human actions, and we will also concede that where there is no freedom there is no moral responsibility; but still it will be necessary to prove that, when conduct can be predicted there is no freedom. This is a psychological or ethical proposition, and as such it lies beyond the pale of Mr. Buckle's inquiries. Though he does not exactly state it in so many words, he slips insensibly into the position that a free will must act in an irregular manner, just as he always has to assume some kind of moral theorem whenever he wishes to connect statistical inquiries with human action. In a note, as usual, he treats the suggestion that a free will may act in a regular manner as a 'barren hypothesis;' and so it is for his purposes. If all you have to do with human action is to predict it, it matters little what feeling it may produce in the minds of individuals. If you can tell that a man will forge or murder, your concern with him ceases, and you care nothing to know whether he feels any amount of self-reproach and mental agony. This is quite indifferent to the social philosopher, but it is all-important to the man himself, and if it depends on the question whether or not he was a free agent, Mr. Buckle's 'barren hypothesis' becomes unspeakably important.

Our objection to Mr. Buckle is, not that he teaches an immoral doctrine, but that he seems to think that he does; and that he does not condescend to point out the method by which his speculations may be reconciled with morality. Not to multiply illustrations of his conduct in this particular, we will confine ourselves to his constant abuse of the word 'law.' He constantly speaks of laws as 'forcing' actions; of conduct as 'obeying' laws; nay, of 'inferior laws' as obeying superior ones. Perhaps the strongest instance of this is a passage in which he says that 'in India slavery, abject, eternal slavery, was the

‘natural state of the great body of the people; it was the state ‘to which they were doomed by *physical, laws utterly impossible ‘to resist.*’ (P. 73.)

From another passage (p. 342.) it appears that Mr. Buckle is well aware of the fact that a law in his sense of the word is nothing more than the description of a fact. To speak of the movements of the planets, as *governed* by the law of gravitation is, in strictness, to put the effect for the cause. By moving in a certain manner the heavenly bodies produce uniform results; but it is a strange inversion of things to say that the uniform results regulate the motions. It is like saying that the pattern weaves the cloth, or that the nautical almanack regulates the tides. Laws, in this sense, have nothing whatever to do with the facts which they are supposed to govern. They exist only in and for the minds which conceive them, and are no more than formulas to which those minds resort, in order to form an opinion as to future events. So long as this is borne in mind, and so long as the word ‘law’ is not supposed to imply compulsion, or the exercise of any definite influence upon human conduct, there may be no other objection to its use than that it is an inappropriate metaphor; but it is, in fact, impossible to abuse language with impunity. The word ‘law’ has a proper sense in which it is constantly used. This sense is that of a command enforced by a sanction, and imposing a duty\*; a command is an intimation from a stronger to a weaker person, that unless the weaker person does something, or forbears to do it, the stronger will hurt him; and thus obedience to a law falls under the description which we have given of a voluntary act—an act, that is, of a personal nature, in which the man himself takes part as a living and willing agent. Men are by nature so much in love with slavery, and the temptation to yield to anything which promises to produce it is so strong, that the mere fact that a man of great learning and ability informs them that their conduct is regulated by a series of laws which they cannot vary or resist, exercises a deep moral influence. To tell people that by law Hindoos must be slaves,—that by law there must be so many murders or suicides, so many births, deaths, and marriages, so many mis-directed letters in a year, and that the particular persons who carry out these general laws are designated by smaller laws which all obey their influence, may be a clumsy and inappropriate way of saying, that Mr. Buckle personally, or any other person who looks into the matter, may have strong reasons for supposing

---

\* The subject is discussed and illustrated with admirable skill in Mr. Austin’s ‘Province of Jurisprudence determined,’ p. 126. •

that these things will happen ; but if it is construed not favourably, but strictly, it is perhaps as immoral, as dangerous, and as utterly false as any language can possibly be.

We should be glad to believe that there is no real inconsistency between Mr. Buckle's views and the fundamental doctrines of theology, which are the existence of God and the providential government of the world. That Mr. Buckle admits the first of these doctrines appears from various passages in his book, though it requires a certain degree of care and thought to discover the fact ; but whether God has anything to do with the world or its affairs, or not, is a question upon which his philosophy has nothing whatever to say. He seems to think that the two things are inconsistent : that the essence of a belief in providence is a belief in the irregularity of human events ; and that as our knowledge of science increases, our faith in the divine government must diminish. He uniformly speaks of every active and definite form of religious belief as 'superstition ;' and he observes that 'each successive discovery, by ascertaining the law that governs certain events, deprives them of that apparent mystery in which they were formerly involved. When any science has made such progress as to enable those who are acquainted with it to foretell the events with which it deals, it is clear that the whole of these events are at once withdrawn from the jurisdiction of supernatural and brought under the authority of natural powers.' It seems to be Mr. Buckle's object to put as wide a line of demarcation as possible between his own and the popular belief upon these subjects, and to show that the establishment of his own faith cannot but be fatal to that of his neighbours. If this is so, we utterly disagree with him. We believe that if there is any kind of opposition in the popular mind between science and theology, it arises from mere narrowness and confusion of thought, and not from the fact that the two sets of conceptions are fundamentally opposed. It is not only not true that the common opinion identifies divine agency with caprice and irregularity, but it is an unquestionable fact that the earliest notions of order and regularity in the material universe were connected with divine agency. When the spirit of God moved on the face of the waters, the result was not confusion but order. When David views God, in relation to the stars, it is the regularity of their movements which impresses him :—'Thou gavest them a law which cannot be broken.'

To the popular apprehension whatever suggests plan and system, suggests also the existence of personal will. We are well aware that the soundness of the argument founded on traces

of design in creation, is frequently denied ; but though it may be a question whether a man who did not believe in a God would be led to do so by observing that the world forms a uniform system, is it not the strangest of all fancies to hold, as seems to be the case with Mr. Buckle, that a person believing in God *aliunde*, will give up his belief on making that discovery ? Whether the argument from design has much affirmative power may fairly be doubted, but we do not understand how it can be turned into a positive argument in favour of atheism. The watch may not prove the existence of a watchmaker, but it is very hard to follow a man, who, believing himself in the maker, and in the watch, holds that his neighbour's belief must fall to the ground as soon as he finds that the watch contains a systematic machinery.

The truth appears to us to be, that Mr. Buckle's contempt for the intellect of the world in general is so great, that though he is an ardent lover of progress, he has an aversion to the very notion of any progress which does not run exactly in his own line of thought. He is quite willing to admit that there is, somewhere or other, a true ground for religious belief, that a few philosophers have at times had glimpses of it, and that in due time it will be scientifically established, but he cannot bear the notion that he and his associates are at best only inventing scientific descriptions for very ancient and very common opinions. He denounces as unscientific and superstitious a belief in the very doctrines which his science recognises, because those who hold them have anticipated its conclusions. What are we to understand by his arbitrary distinction between supernatural and natural powers ? What are supernatural powers but the powers which govern nature ? What is 'Nature' but a vague expression for a creation framed, animated, and ruled by the will of its Creator ? Superstition consists not in the belief in this Cause, but in the supposition that its action is occasional rather than eternal, partial rather than universal.

It is by showing a man the foundation of the truth, which he holds already, that he is to be led into a wider view of it ; for it is this which constitutes the ground common to himself and to his critic. We will illustrate our meaning by a single instance. It is a common practice to speak of certain isolated important events as being 'providential,' and it is not uncommon to describe them as if they had some peculiar and special claim to that title,—as if it belonged to them, not only in a positive, but also in a negative and exclusive sense. People often refer to such events as the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, the winds which, truly or not, were supposed to

have baffled the Spanish Armada, the narrow escapes which eminent persons have experienced from assassination and so forth, as being caused by God in some special manner, which could not be predicated of other things. Such a way of thinking would be open to the obvious and conclusive objection that by implication it excludes divine agency from all but a few human affairs, if it rested on the notion that these events were of an entirely exceptional character; and this again suggests two very different lines of thought. The one is that which is followed, or seems to be followed, by Mr. Buckle, and it consists in arguing that as many events, once looked upon as providential and mysterious, have been shown to be regular in their recurrence,—to be susceptible of being predicted, and, in some cases, of being prevented by human skill,—so there is a strong probability that the same may be true of other events, which have not as yet been subjected to the same process. It is tacitly assumed that none but mysterious and unpredictable events can fairly be described as providential; and, therefore, if all events are so far explained as to be classified, it will follow, on this hypothesis, that the tendency of science is to eliminate Providence from the world altogether. The whole force of this argument lies in the assumption that to be providential an event must be mysterious in the sense of being unaccountable, and this assumption (not proved by Mr. Buckle) is not adopted by those who take up the other line of thought to which we have referred. They, on the contrary, would probably argue that, if a sufficiently wide view is taken either of human affairs in general, or of the life of a single individual, a certain moral sequence will be discernible in them; and thus they are led to the conjecture, not that the particular events in question are not providential, although the reasons for which they may be considered so are false, but that there is reason to believe that, if we could only see it, it would appear that all other events are providential also; and thus they ultimately arrive, not at the conclusion that God's providence is eliminated from human life, but that it embraces every item of which it is made up. In other words, they believe that human affairs form a vast moral whole, too vast, wide, and intricate probably for any finite intellect to grasp, either in its outline, or even in its details in a complete and satisfactory manner, but not the less joined together by such links as those which in some isolated cases may be seen to establish a general connection between goodness and happiness, vice and misery.

It would be foreign to our purpose to enforce or to enlarge upon this theory. We are only concerned to point out the facts

that, so far from contradicting social philosophy, it implies, if not the possibility of its attainment by finite intelligences, at any rate the truth, that whether attainable or not, it has at least an ideal existence. It has the immense advantage of being what Mr. Buckle would call a barren hypothesis. That is, it supplies the intellect with no new conclusion, and does not in the remotest degree fetter its operations, though it addresses itself powerfully to the feelings and to the conscience. It not only has no interest in suppressing, perverting, or evading an appeal to facts, but, on the contrary, it makes the appeal itself. If the facts of life and nature are the theatre of the providential government of the world, it is through those facts that this government must be studied. If the moral attributes of the Creator are displayed in them, those attributes must be collected from them. In order to appreciate the relation which this theory bears to science, it must be remembered that no one advances it as a scientific proposition. It rests not on scientific bases but on probabilities, on analogies, and on a variety of evidence which must of course carry very different degrees of conviction to different minds. Belief in it will no doubt colour the moral tone of a man's nature. It will be of unspeakable comfort and support in the changes and chances of life, because it will lead him to think that he is in the hands of a Being who has like himself the mysterious attributes of personal existence and of a moral nature, and that he is not the mere plaything of a senseless result which people call a law. It will not, on the other hand, have the most remote tendency to deter his mind from the contemplation of facts or to warp him in their study. It no doubt involves the use of language of a very indefinite kind, but in all subjects men use language which they imperfectly understand, and to which a further acquaintance with facts attaches new meanings. This is the condition of progress in every study. The use of such words as 'force,' 'power,' 'electricity,' 'magnetism,' long preceded even those approximations to definitions which we have now arrived at. Mr. Buckle himself also writes about civilisation as if he knew what it meant. Yet he constantly implies that theology forms an exception to all other subjects of inquiry, and that the truth respecting it is to be obtained not by the improvement and extension of existing conceptions, but by their fundamental destruction.

We know not whether Mr. Buckle's principles necessarily place him in opposition to the fundamental doctrines either of morality or of theology. But we do think that a misconception pervades the whole of his argument, which leads him to take a

very false general view of their importance to mankind, and to estimate many features of history in a very inadequate manner. The subject of his whole book is 'civilisation.' He constantly uses the word, and almost always writes as if it represented a sort of *summum bonum*, the supreme importance of which is self-evident and universally admitted. Most people, we imagine, understand by civilisation the process of acquiring and applying knowledge, or of accumulating wealth, but Mr. Buckle, though he never enters into detailed explanations on the point, seems to give the word a very much wider scope. He appears to believe that there is in all human affairs a constant homogeneous progress, which progress mainly depends upon the accumulation of knowledge. He says, for example, 'There can be no doubt that a people are not really advancing if on the one hand their increasing ability is accompanied by increasing vice, or if on the other hand, whilst they are becoming more virtuous they likewise become more ignorant. This double movement, moral and intellectual, is essential to the very idea of civilisation, and includes the entire theory of mental progress;' and he proceeds to argue that the intellectual element of this progress is by far the most important part of it. This he establishes by various arguments, the most important of which may be gathered, though it is somewhat indistinctly stated, from a passage which will be found at pp. 160-5., and it is, we think, reducible to the following form:—There is in human affairs a vast homogeneous progress. It is a function of two variables—intellectual and moral. The intellectual element is the more important of the two, because it is progressive, whilst the moral element is constant. Therefore the whole progress may be apprehended by studying the intellectual element, and by looking on the moral element as productive merely of disturbance. In illustration of this general view, we may quote such an expression as this:—

'If the advance of civilisation and the general happiness of mankind depend more on their moral feelings than on their intellectual knowledge, we must of course measure the progress of society by those feelings; while if, on the other hand, it depends principally on their knowledge, we must take as our standard the amount and success of their intellectual activity.'

In another place he says —

'The actions of individuals are greatly affected by their moral feelings and passions; but those being antagonistic to the passions and feelings of other individuals are balanced by them; so that their effect is, in the great average of human affairs, nowhere to be seen; and the total actions of mankind, considered as a whole, are left to be

regulated by the total knowledge of which mankind is possessed.' (P. 208.)

Mr. Buckle would probably himself acknowledge that this is the fundamental proposition of his whole book; but we must be permitted to say that a proposition more inconsistent with fact, with reason, and with experience has seldom been stated. If moral truths are, as he goes on to say, those which are most universally acknowledged, on what ground can he argue that their influence is balanced by the conflict or antagonism of individual character? Take the great moral dogmas which protect the security of life, the sanctity of marriage, the possession of property. Will Mr. Buckle assert that their effect on the great average of human affairs is nowhere to be seen, because there are in the world some murderers, some adulterers, and some thieves? or does he presume to assert that the maintenance of these primary conditions of social life, and consequently of all civilisation, depends not on the immutable laws of morality, but on the 'total knowledge of which mankind is possessed?' The first and highest knowledge of which mankind is possessed is precisely the knowledge not of physical facts, or of statistical averages, or of the ill-digested lumber of the brain, but of the rules of life which govern and restrain the moral feelings and passions of individuals.

But Mr. Buckle goes on to state that 'in reference to our moral conduct, there is not a single principle now known to the most cultivated European which was not likewise known to the ancients;' that 'the system of morals propounded in the New Testament contained no maxim which had not been previously enunciated; and that some of the most beautiful passages in the Apostolic writings are quotations from Pagan authors is well known to every scholar;' and that 'to assert that Christianity communicated to man moral truths previously unknown, argues on the part of the assertors either gross ignorance or wilful fraud.' Since Mr. Buckle uses these unphilosophical expressions, savouring rather of passion than of knowledge, we are compelled to reply that the ignorance and the fraud in this case will not be found to be on the side of the assertor. In the first place, the passages in the Apostolic writings known to be quotations from Pagan authors are in number three—the verse from Menander, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' the expression, 'The Cretans are liars,' and the passage from Aratus in St. Paul's address to the Athenians. This may be mere want of biblical scholarship on the part of Mr. Buckle; but when he goes on to assert that the system of Christian morals contains no maxim not previously



enunciated by Pagan writers, he overlooks the fundamental principles on which the modern civilisation of mankind chiefly rests—the equality of men before God, the dignity of humility, the sanctity of marriage, the forgiveness of injuries, the law of charity embracing the whole human race, purity of life, and the rights specially conferred by Christianity on those who had no other protection. When he pretends that Paganism anticipated Christianity in raising the condition of woman, in blessing the innocence of childhood, in giving relief to the sick and liberty to the slave, it is not to ignorance that misstatements so gross can be attributed. What is this, to use the striking metaphor of Mr. Coleridge, but to hang grapes on thorns, and then pretend that they are the natural fruit of the tree?

The same spirit may be traced in the following passages:—In a note (p. 724.) Mr. Buckle says, ‘The original scheme of Christianity, as stated by its Great Author, was merely to convert the Jews; and if the doctrines of Christ had never extended beyond that ignorant people, they could not have received those modifications which philosophy imposed on them.’ But in the next page, speaking of Mahometanism, he calls it, ‘that great religion, the noise of which has filled the world,’ and he terms its founder ‘the great apostle who diffused among millions of idolaters the sublime unity of one God.’ Such is Mr. Buckle’s conception of the relative grandeur of that scheme which had for its object the redemption of mankind and of the fanatical conquests and pretended revelations of the Arabian impostor! These are precisely the views which might reasonably be anticipated from a writer who assigns the very highest place in French literature to Voltaire; and almost the same expressions are to be found in the sixth and seventh chapters of the ‘*Essai sur les Mœurs*’ of that author.

Whenever Mr. Buckle has occasion to advert to the principles of religion and morals (which he does as sparingly as he can), we perceive that he regards them not as objective truths, but as certain modes of human thought or opinion, having their source and seat solely in the human mind, and consequently partaking of the obscurity or illumination of the intellectual faculties. A religion may, he says, be ‘good or bad’; but he appears not to inquire whether it be true or false. Hence he is led to the singular conclusion that religion, morals, and government are not causes of civilisation, but its results, and that the cause is to be sought in intellectual progress only. So, too, he argues that war and religious persecution, being the greatest evils which afflict mankind, have been greatly diminishing for a length of time, and that their diminution is owing to intellectual, and not to moral causes.

Morals, he says, are unimportant because they are unprogressive. But the slightest reflection will show that this test of progress is entirely fallacious, for it would exclude not moral truths alone, because they are unprogressive, but all the noblest conquests and achievements of the human intellect. It would exclude the creations of art, of which Mr. Buckle singularly enough takes no account in his survey of human history: wherever man has succeeded in clothing his ideas in a complete form,—whether in the architecture which crowns the Acropolis of Athens, in the sculpture of Pheidias or of Michael Angelo, on the canvas of Raphael or of Rembrandt, in the dramas of Shakspeare or the symphonies of Beethoven,—there is no question of ulterior progress, because these works attain their essential limit of perfection. It would exclude the operations of mathematical science, from the multiplication table to the ‘Principia’ of Newton, because by the very nature of exact and absolute truth nothing can be added to, or taken from, its theorems. However certain or conspicuous the truths of morality, the principles of art, or the deductions of science may be, it is not the less certain that to each individual man, to each individual mind, the same track of knowledge remains to be followed which other generations have explored. The inheritance of knowledge, collected and transmitted by the experience of mankind, immeasurably transcends that slight deposit which any man or generation of men can add to it. But Mr. Buckle appears to derive his conception of the advancement of civilisation from the elements which are still obscure, uncertain, and incomplete, rather than from the truths which are most clear, positive, and essential to the welfare of mankind.

The whole argument appears to us to rest on a double fallacy. It is not proved that there is any such moral and intellectual progress in human affairs as Mr. Buckle assumes to exist. That men have the power to accumulate knowledge, and that for some centuries they have in some countries had the will to do so, is no doubt perfectly true; but so far as we know, the will has existed at limited periods only, and amongst a comparatively small number of the inhabitants of small portions of the globe. In antiquity the same phenomena occurred in certain countries, lasted a certain time, and then disappeared, precisely because though their intellectual culture was still unchecked, their moral culture had decayed. As to the alleged moral progress which Mr. Buckle in one place considers ‘essential to the very idea of civilisation,’ and inseparably conjoined with the progress of intelligence, though in another he seems to deny its existence and even its possibility, we see very

little evidence indeed that it exists. The most civilised nations, using that word in the common sense, are not always the most virtuous; nor are the most learned men—and society is composed of individuals—always the best of their species. The two things stand upon different principles, and though they may probably bear some relation to each other, the relation is, in all probability, one of a very complicated kind. First, therefore, we deny that there is any progress in which morality plays the secondary part assigned to it by Mr. Buckle. That in some countries men have for some centuries accumulated a great variety of knowledge, and that there is reason to think they will continue to do so, we fully admit; but secondly we deny that the success of this pursuit is the *summum bonum* of human life. Mr. Buckle appears to us to have begun by misusing the word ‘civilisation,’ in attempting to make it include an imaginary moral progress, and to have then proceeded at his ease to show that in civilisation (in the narrower sense) morality is a comparatively unimportant ingredient. His proof of its comparative unimportance consists in showing that it has little to do with something which is not proved to exist, but which, if it did exist, would unquestionably be the highest object of human pursuit.

To pronounce with anything approaching to dogmatic certainty upon so vast a question as the relations of morality and intellect, would be presumptuous indeed in any one who could not appeal to special investigations of immense extent in support of his assertions. We advance no such claims; but we would submit, upon narrower and more familiar grounds, that a somewhat different view may be taken of the subject. It appears to us that morals operate upon civilisation, not as an unimportant constituent part of its progress, but as conditions which, though constant for the most part during very long spaces of time, determine the whole character of the nation in which they exist; and we are also of opinion that the most important elements of human happiness are not those which are progressive, but those which are stationary. We will attempt to illustrate these suggestions fully, because by doing so we shall set in the clearest light the fundamental difference between the views taken by ourselves, and by Mr. Buckle, of the proper subjects of history, and the relative importance of historical events.

Let us consider, in the first place, the distinct character and progress of civilisation in the cases of Europe, India, and China, which Mr. Buckle attributes entirely to the differences of soil, climate, diet, and the general aspect of nature, or at most to their respective intellectual progress. From the time when

this part of the globe was a very rude place, inhabited by very rough and barbarous people, Europeans have believed in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the government of the world by one God, and as a rule—though the rule is subject to very great modifications—they have believed, and have acted upon the belief, that a life of activity was the way to serve God most acceptably. In India, on the other hand, those who thought most deeply on these questions, and who were the objects of the popular veneration, believed not in a living, but in what we may call, without exaggeration, a dead God. Their *summum bonum* was eternal death; their notion of future punishment a prolongation of life. In China, again, a different state of things seems to have prevailed from a very early time indeed. The devout Buddhists and the mystics have always formed a small minority there, and the practices which they induced the mass of the people to adopt never rose above the rank of mere idle superstitions, destitute of any kind of moral significance or influence. The creed of the higher minds in China was and is Confucianism—a doctrine which takes no notice of any considerations extending beyond this present life; though within its limits it inculcates a very strict, and what is perhaps more singular, a very subtle code of morals.\* These are three distinct moral conditions, which have been constant in their operation upon vast masses of men over long spaces of time. There is no reason to think that when they began to operate, northern Europe possessed more knowledge than India, or so much as China; yet during the whole of the enormous accumulation of knowledge which has taken place during the last 1400 years in this part of the world, the same causes have been and still are in full operation. An Englishman still has before him his Maker and his own soul, and looks upon death as a gate to life; a Hindoo is still aspiring after annihilation; a Chinese is still principally anxious to live according to ‘the rites,’ and dies with the most perfect unconcern. It is impossible, *à priori*, that differences so vast should not affect the whole tone of a man’s life, regulate his desire to acquire knowledge, power, and riches, and to a great extent direct their use when

---

\* See Meadows’ Chinese and their Rebellion. Mr. Buckle does not appear in his present volume to have examined the institutions of China with the minute attention he has bestowed on those of other countries. But the civilisation of that peculiar people seems to be precisely that to which his own system points, since they boast of the highest degree of intellectual culture which a nation has attained, irrespective of religion and morality founded on religious truth.

acquired. When we find that, in point of fact, there has been in Europe a constant progress in all kinds of knowledge and power, for there the current view of morals carries a man out of himself, by teaching him to live for his kind here and to hope for immortality hereafter; that in China there has been ceaseless activity with very little progress, for there a view of morals prevails which binds men to certain fixed duties, whilst it supplies no motive which can warm the heart or vivify the soul; that in India there has been no progress and no activity except in those monuments of despotism which attest the cheapness of human labour and the recklessness with which it is wasted; it is impossible to resist the conclusion, that the views which men take of the moral purpose and nature of life, must exercise a very powerful influence indeed over the assiduity with which they will cultivate knowledge, and over the degree in which they will value it when attained. In other words, human life cannot be understood by reference to science alone, for the deepest problems which it presents—problems of the most vital and practical nature—lie beyond the reach of scientific investigation.

Let us now take, as a further illustration of our meaning, a single question, which has a very deep interest at the present day, and which, notwithstanding all Mr. Buckle's ingenuity, appears to us to have played, if not the most important, at any rate a most important, part in the history of modern Europe. We allude to the famous problem as to the nature of the true ideal of virtue. Speaking very broadly, we may say that two views upon this subject, each compatible with any amount of learning, cultivation, and acuteness, have long prevailed, and at this moment do prevail, in the world. There is, on the one hand, the ascetic, and on the other, what we may call the social, view of the question. The notion that pleasure is of the nature of sin; that all the instincts and affections of humanity have about them something wicked and corrupt; that he is the best man who separates himself most completely from other men; that those are the holiest occupations in which people are brought into the least frequent contact with the common business of life—is one opinion. The doctrine that the common affairs of the world are the appointed spheres in which men are to labour, and earn the wages of their labour, and employ them when earned; that the common affections of life are manifestations of the highest and holiest affections, and are to be cultivated and prized accordingly; that the production of general happiness is the good fruit by which the goodness of the tree may be known; and that so far from seeking to cut himself off from his kind, a man can only

realise his true duty and real position by uniting himself to other men, and by sympathising with them as closely as possible — is another doctrine. Nothing, we apprehend, can be better ascertained than the fact, that the whole social and political life in a nation will be deeply affected by its adoption of the one or the other of these views; and that ever, their disposition to accumulate knowledge will depend on it. The moral teaching of the Romish Church inculcates the former of these theories; the practical genius of Protestantism prescribes the latter. The one is the morality of Italy or Spain; the other is the morality of England. England in the present day possesses a greater accumulation of knowledge than Italy; in the 15th and 16th centuries Italy and Spain were probably far more learned than England; yet if we may judge by the acceptance met with by the Reformation in the two countries, they had even then embraced the same views of morality which we find in them at the present day. If this view of the subject is correct, we have a clear case of a moral condition, which, though not in itself progressive, has modified the whole course, and contributed enormously to the energy with which the accumulation of knowledge has proceeded.

There is another side of the subject by which the same conclusions may be reached. Mr. Buckle takes it for granted that if there is in human affairs a progressive and a stationary element, the progressive element must necessarily be the more important of the two in the eyes of the student of civilisation; and no doubt if civilisation is taken to mean the process of acquiring and applying knowledge, this is not only a true but an identical proposition. If, however, it is used in that comprehensive sense in which Mr. Buckle seems to understand it, its soundness becomes extremely questionable, for it would amount to an assertion that the particulars in which a modern Englishman differs from his ancestor who lived under William the Conqueror are more important than those in which he agrees with him. Or to take a vertical instead of a horizontal section of society, it would imply that a highly educated and accomplished English gentleman of the present day differs from an ignorant day labourer in more essential respects than those in which he resembles him. We should entirely disagree with each of these propositions. In the first place, the accumulation and application of knowledge flies over the heads of the great mass of mankind, and affects them almost entirely through their outward circumstances. The labouring population of England are probably far more comfortable now than they ever were before. They are better housed, better fed, better clothed,

and longer lived than their forefathers; but is an ordinary working man now a very different being from a working man under the Tudors. Are the differences greater than the resemblances? We cannot conceive how any one can seriously maintain the affirmative. Alter the spelling and the grammar, and Shakspeare's common soldiers might write home letters from India or the Crimea. Bates, Williams, and the other good yeomen whose limbs were made in England, are as much like their countrymen of the nineteenth century, as if they had crossed the Channel in the Golden Fleece, and been carried to Agincourt by the Northern Railway. They differ in their circumstances as a day labourer may differ from a small farmer, but the men are essentially the same. They love and hate, they think and speak, and fight, in precisely the same way, and on just the same principles. Even between different classes living in the same age, the moral identity is more important than the intellectual disparity. The most cultivated man in the country can sympathise both readily and perfectly with the coarsest and most ignorant upon all that touches the moral feelings—upon the passions which decide their conduct in the most important crises of existence. Moral differences comparatively slight and faint jar upon the feelings far more than the widest intellectual disparity. That the constant and unprogressive element of life is more important than the progressive one might be shown by endless illustrations. If Mr. Buckle's view is correct, it must act both ways. If virtue adds less to our happiness than knowledge, vice must be less dreadful than ignorance. Yet even he, we presume, would not accept the conscience of Nero as the price of the mind of Newton, nor would he think it patriotic to wish that his countrymen might be the brightest, wisest, meanest of mankind.

We must not, however, forget that Mr. Buckle appeals to fact as well as to theory. The growth of knowledge, he tells us, has in point of fact diminished the two greatest evils under which humanity labours, namely, war and religious persecution, and for that purpose morals have been powerless; in support of this he appeals to the history of Europe for the last three centuries, and traces out with his usual skill the influence which political economy has exerted in diminishing a taste for war, and in showing that upon economical grounds it can never be anything better than a necessary evil. The argument is a fair sample of the way in which Mr. Buckle deals with history. Facts are so numerous and complex that an argument may be made to wear an air of exhaustive completeness, although it is in reality most partial and imperfect. Mr. Buckle adduces a vast mass of evi-

dence and information in support of his views ; but to state the bearings of the whole of the evidence on this subject would have probably exhausted the space at his disposal ; and the result is, that though at first sight the cogency of the argument and the force of the illustration seem all but conclusive, they turn out upon further examination to be one-sided and imperfect.

Mr. Buckle's object is to prove that morals have done little to diminish war. He shows that in an ignorant age war was common in Europe, and that in cultivated ages, with moral conditions substantially the same, it shows a tendency to decrease in frequency ; therefore, he concludes, the knowledge, and not the morals, caused its diminution. Surely this is very lame logic. That under the moral and religious conditions of European society an increase of knowledge has produced a tendency to peace may be quite true, but it is a very different thing from what Mr. Buckle asserts. That the moral and religious conditions in question are most important elements in producing the result may be proved by a variety of arguments. Quakerism and Peace Societies are but exaggerated expressions of the universal moral sentiment, that, though under certain circumstances war may be an awful duty, a needless war would be a great crime, whilst any war is a great misfortune. That this moral feeling is not a mere result of intellectual cultivation is proved by the fact that it is not strongest amongst those classes whose cultivation is greatest. A Peace Congress would not be formed out of the most cultivated of mankind. We find, moreover, that where the moral element is either weak or wanting, the result does not ensue. In America, want of practical knowledge of the subject and the extreme audacity and restlessness of the national temperament unite to diminish such feelings ; and though there is plenty of knowledge in America there is no more warlike nation in the world. If they had only neighbours enough, it is hard to doubt that they would be always fighting. The people of England, though not wanting in knowledge of political economy or in experience of the evils of war, are still one of the most combative nations in the world, as soon as they can persuade themselves that they have a moral object to fight for. The strongest case of all, however, is ancient Rome. There for centuries there was a regular and constant progress in most of the arts of life ; but in the absence of any moral disapproval of war, they went on conquering till nothing was left to conquer. The '*pax Romana*' was peace indeed ; but it was a worse evil than the most destructive of wars, for it crushed the men to whom the cares and risks of national life would have been a



source of virtue and power into a set of effeminate, debauched, and oppressed provincials.

With respect to religious persecution we think Mr. Buckle's remark still less exact. The habit of persecution is unquestionably diminished, under certain conditions, by the increase of knowledge; but those conditions are absolutely essential, and are exclusively dependent on morality and religion. If people persecute each other from a mistaken zeal and distorted love — if they really do torture the body to save the soul (and Mr. Buckle not only admits, but insists, that in Christian persecutions this has been the case), — their tendency to persecute will no doubt be diminished by showing how ill-adapted the end is to the means, and how questionable the end is in itself. If, however, the persecutor has no sort of wish to benefit his victim, if what he wants is to protect himself, an increase of knowledge may often embitter his fury. The growth of knowledge in modern Europe has contributed to teach Protestants and Catholics that it is their wisest and best course to leave to God the ultimate decision on their differences. The growth of knowledge in ancient Rome provoked the Emperors to persecute the Christians. The real progress lies not merely in a knowledge of the worthlessness of persecution, but in a more liberal and humane conception of the rights of conscience. It is a fair example of that moral progress which Mr. Buckle denies. The morality of the sixteenth century sent a heretic to the stake; the morality of the nineteenth century respects his freedom.

Such a defect as a habit of mind leading its possessor to undervalue moral causes cannot fail to have serious influence upon the view which he takes of concrete history. It would be endless to specify all the ways in which this circumstance colours the latter part of Mr. Buckle's book; but in order to make our meaning plain we will attempt to mark a few of the practical results to which his principles conduct him. The first is a very obscure, or as we think it, a very imperfect conception of the true objects of social and individual existence. The acquisition of knowledge is that object according to Mr. Buckle. And what then? There is another answer. To live well and to die well, to pass through life nobly and to leave it hopefully, these are the great objects which men and nations ought to seek — objects equally open to the philosopher, the statesman, and the lowest peasant or labourer — equally accessible in the tenth century and in the nineteenth. The road to heaven is as short by sea as by land, said the brave Sir Humphrey Gilbert as his ship went down. The journey is the important point,

and not the conveyance; but Mr. Buckle seems to think that if you travel in a first-class carriage it matters very little which way you go.

This want of sympathy for the elements of heroism and lofty character, when they happen to be separated from high intellectual attainments, or to manifest themselves in an age of intellectual obscurity, renders Mr. Buckle entirely incapable of appreciating the spirit of the Middle Ages. Because the era of scepticism had not begun, because letters were still chiefly in the hands of the clergy, because (as he asserts) 'the art of writing directly encourages the propagation of falsehoods,' because men still believed in an overruling Providence;—he represents the annals of those ages as a tissue of childish absurdities; and he quotes in support of this opinion a multitude of old wives' fables, extracted from the chronicles of the time. Nor does he introduce a single remark to denote that these legends are not a fair test of the intellectual condition of the Middle Ages. His learning, vast as it appears to be, does not embrace any of the great lights of mediæval philosophy, history, or art; he has not a word, save of scorn, for the stupendous labours of the great churchmen, for the dialectics of the schools, or for the genius which never shone more brightly than in the immortal verses of Dante. We appeal from this narrow and partial decision to the energy of those great minds, and to the Middle Ages themselves. There, and nowhere else, is to be found the root and foundation of those great institutions from which the laws, the liberties, and the government of modern Europe spring. There are still to be distinguished through the gloom of ages those gigantic figures of Charlemagne, Alfred, and Norman William, whose strength and wisdom moulded the empires of their posterity; and to convey an opinion of the Middle Ages solely by a loose statement of their ignorance and their credulity, is to overlook the existence and extent of powers and truths of the utmost importance to the subsequent history of mankind. One might infer from Mr. Buckle, that the records of our race begin with the seventeenth century of the Christian era, because he then first applies his method of interpreting them.\*

---

\* For instance, Mr. Buckle says "There are few things in our history so irrational as the admiration expressed by a certain class of our writers for the institutions of our barbarous Anglo-Saxon ancestors;" and he adds (truly) that trial by jury did not exist till long after the Conquest. But Mr. Forsyth has shown in his excellent *History of Trial by Jury* that 'the jury system may be traced as a gradual and natural sequence from the modes of trial in use

Mr. Buckle's theory of progress appears to us to be not only unwholesome in practice, but opposed to one of the most striking features of history. He continually dwells upon the insignificance of all individual efforts in the great mass of human affairs. To discover a scientific principle is in his eyes to make a decided step in advance; but any other form of individual effort is of little importance. Great men, no doubt do exist, and must, 'at present,' be looked upon as a disturbing force in human affairs; but though they exist, they are merely, as Mr. Buckle contends, the creatures of the age to which they belong. This appears to us to ignore the fact that there are in history critical periods at which one man's will or energy may produce the most durable results. We are far from entertaining the shallow opinion that great events are to be attributed to small causes, but we do believe that, though the events of life flow in a deep and full stream, the nature of the country through which they pass is such that a small obstacle will often divert their course. At almost every great crisis in history the victory has been but narrowly won, and the defeated party have, to say the least, been a strong minority. How different would the face of Europe be now from what it actually is, if Nelson had been gratified in his wish of meeting Napoleon on a wind. It is very easy to say that Napoleon was the product of circumstances, and that if he had been shot they would have produced another. We very much doubt the fact. It is another form of the old fallacy that, after throwing all the other throws on the dice, you have a better chance of throwing sixes than you had at first. A dilemma is often fallacious, because it is hardly ever exhaustive, but it does appear to us that upon this subject one of two conclusions is inevitable, neither of which would be welcome to Mr. Buckle. Either human affairs must occasionally be influenced in the most extensive and durable manner by the fortunes of particular men, or there must exist some controlling power which overrules the actions of individuals by supplying their places with new comers who would otherwise have remained in obscurity. Either Napoleon's death would have changed the face of Eu-

---

' amongst the Anglo-Saxons and Anglo-Normans,—that is both before ' and after the Conquest; ' and nothing is more certain than that the distinctive characteristics of the laws and institutions of this country originated at the earliest period of our history, and that it was the intention of William I. to preserve to his English subjects the rights which were the inheritance of every Anglo-Saxon freeman. (*For-syth*, p. 95.)

rope, or without any sort of traceable or assignable reason some other person would have supplied his place. That other person, if there was one in the background, was contented in the events which happened to remain in obscurity ; for amongst the public men of the day known to history there was not one who can be compared to him.

History is full of such examples. 'What would have happened if Asdrubal had won the battle of the Metaurus and Hannibal had conquered Rome? What if the heiress of Charles the Bold had carried the best half of France to another husband, and two third-rate states instead of one first-rate one had replaced the great French nation? What if Charles I. had not kept Cromwell in England, or had marched on London when he besieged Gloucester? History is not like chess, in which the best player must win, but rather like whist, in which a very slight difference in the cards may give a skilful player a decisive advantage over a player more skilful but less fortunate. We do not deny that in many instances the tendencies of the age are so strong that nothing which could happen to any single man would do more than arrest or accelerate their course to a small extent; but if we choose a critical period of history, we may well imagine how a very few individual changes would have changed the history of the world. Let us suppose that James II. had been content to be a civil tyrant instead of insisting on being a spiritual one also; can it be doubted that he might have retarded for many years the growth of English liberty? Suppose at the same time the Duke of Burgundy had succeeded to the throne of Louis XIV., had convoked the States General, and seriously laboured to reform abuses. Can any one say that these two changes might not have produced at least two results which would have altered the whole complexion of modern history? France might have superseded England in founding the Indian empire, and in peopling the North American continent. If, in the middle of the eighteenth century, France had been a powerful well-governed State, whilst England was torn by civil war, or by furious party struggles between a Popish king and a Protestant population, who can say that Dupleix would not have triumphed over Laurence and Clive, and that Montcalm would not have conquered New York instead of dying before Quebec? If these two great outlets of the characteristic genius of England had been blocked up, what would our history have been? We should certainly not have been able to look forward to a day not very distant, when English religion, law, and literature, will cover the world, and mould the minds of hundreds of millions of men in every quarter of the globe.

But in truth we need not travel beyond the field of Mr. Buckle's own researches for similar examples. As we entered upon the latter chapters of this volume in which he discusses some of the elements of positive history in England and in France, we anticipated an application of his own principles, and at least an attempt to show that the course of events in these countries has been governed by some of those fixed causes which he asserts to be the true motives of human action. But in this expectation the reader will be totally disappointed. No trace of identity or of logical connexion can be discovered between 'the History of the Protective Spirit in England and France,' and the statistical averages, or meteorological phenomena, in the first chapter. On the contrary, Mr. Buckle, in this later portion of his labours, has put forth all his strength in delineating the personal characters of Cardinal Richelieu and Mr. Burke, of Louis XIV. and George III., and he falls back, as much as any historian of the old school, on the action of the moral feelings or passions of these individuals on the world. Nay, he even condescends to trace, in a variety of minute anecdotes and amusing details, the sources of events which, if his system had any truth in it, would be utterly superfluous and undeserving of notice. For example, he tells us:—

'In the middle of the eighteenth century there was an actress on the French stage of the name of Chantilly. She, though beloved by Maurice de Saxe, preferred a more honourable attachment, and married Favart, the well-known writer of songs and comic operas. Maurice, amazed at her boldness, applied for aid to the French Crown. That he should have made such an application is sufficiently strange; but the result of it is hardly to be paralleled except in some eastern despotism. The Government of France, on hearing the circumstances, had the inconceivable baseness to issue an order directing Favart to abandon his wife and entrust her to the charge of Maurice.'

'These are among the insufferable provocations by which the blood of men is made to boil in their veins. Who can wonder that the greatest and noblest minds in France were filled with loathing at the government by whom such things are done? If we, notwithstanding the distance of time and country, are roused to indignation by the mere mention of them, what must have been felt by those before whose eyes they actually occurred?'

With the same generous enthusiasm Mr. Buckle denounces the monstrous abuses which preceded the French Revolution; but is there no moral feeling or passion in his indignation? And will he contend that the outbreak of the French people arose less from their increasing sufferings than from their increasing

knowledge? The truth is, that no sooner does Mr. Buckle begin to deal with flesh and blood, and to pass judgment on men and events famous in history, than we perceive him to be far more a child of moral feeling and passion than he would have us suppose. He makes very small account of the real state of things he has to discuss, and when it suits his purpose or his whim he represents Cardinal Richelieu as a liberal and Burke as a lunatic.\* So contradictory and extravagant are his prepossessions, that while he denounces the reign of Louis XIV. as the grave of the independence and original intellectual power of France, he fails to perceive that Richelieu and Mazarin were the true founders of that despotic monarchy which crushed the nascent liberties of the French nation, and made Louis XIV. the most absolute of sovereigns. So little has Mr. Buckle succeeded in reducing any one passage of history to his formulary, that we have hardly met with a single political judgment expressed by him which might not be assailed by endless contradictions. While he seeks to maintain his system by an appeal to facts, often presented in a very questionable light, the inexorable logic of facts does in reality confute his theory.

It is in a spirit nearly akin to that which leads him to assign too uniform a character to the course of historical events, that Mr. Buckle systematically underrates the importance of all the pursuits of active life. He fixes his eye on a vast imaginary march of events which is quite independent of all individual effort or control, which depends not on the will of any one man, or of any set of men, but ultimately on the slow but sure accumulations of science, which are always proceeding. Men of letters and men of science are, he considers, the true civilisers. Adam Smith, we are told, 'by the publication of one solitary work, contributed more towards the happiness of man than has been effected by the united abilities of all the statesmen and legislators of whom history has preserved an authentic account.' The connection between this theory and that systematic neglect of morality and indifference to all considerations, except those which bear upon the accumulation and application of knowledge, is self-evident. A statesman or legislator does not advance, and does not claim to do so. He only solves old

---

\* From the moment he began to write against the French Revolution. Yet we would ask where does Mr. Buckle find a more extraordinary instance of the power of foretelling the course of human events than in the works written after the great statesman had degenerated into an angry brawler? (*Buckle*, p. 464.)

problems under new shapes. In all his undertakings moral qualities have a conspicuous, if not the most important, share. Courage, firmness, honesty, and plain dealing may in many cases supply the place of intellect in such occupations, but no amount of intellect can supersede them. Politicians are accordingly the objects of Mr. Buckle's dislike, we might almost say of his contempt. He regrets that Burke devoted himself to politics. 'His powers,' he says, 'were worthy of far nobler things.' He reserves his genuine sympathy for such a statesman as Richelieu, whose policy he affects to admire because he considers it essentially revolutionary. He seems to be of opinion that all European governments were for many ages, and in many parts of the world still are, merely obstructive and injurious bodies, and that the only part which a wise man can condescend to take in their affairs is that of subverting the principles by which they are supported, reducing their power to a minimum, making them feel their essential insignificance, and preparing them to receive with docility the commands of the scientific and literary classes. He considers that governments have rendered no services to civilisation, except that of preventing crime, and he seems to wish to confine them as much as possible to that and to similar functions. The temper he displays in speaking of the honours with which custom has in most parts of the world invested the governing classes is a striking illustration of his views on this subject. He speaks of the French and English aristocracy, not with a qualified and discriminating mixture of praise and blame, not even with measured historical disapproval, but with a violent bitter personal dislike and indignation which is always unpleasant, and sometimes offensive and vulgar.

With respect to the general question of the importance of active life, we entirely and fundamentally differ from Mr. Buckle. We hold that even if it is not the highest of human vocations, it is at least fully equal both in dignity and importance to any other; and in particular we think that men of letters and science show nothing but a petulant misapprehension of their position when they despise it in comparison with their own pursuits. Mr. Buckle, one would think, is at any rate estopped from denying this position. One of the most prominent parts of his book, the foundation indeed of all his speculations about English history, is to be found in the assertion that the greatness of England arises principally from the sturdiness and hardihood of the national character. This sturdiness he traces back to what he supposes to be its origin; and if we are to believe him,

it is the result of a happy combination of circumstances of which the most important was the Norman Conquest. In consequence of that event we are told the distance between the king and the aristocracy was greater here than in any other part of Europe. Hence the people acquired the habit of transacting their own affairs, and by degrees their whole way of life became what we are all familiar with. If this is true, how strange a contradiction it is of all that Mr. Buckle has preached in the earlier part of his book! In whatever sense a man has it in his power to determine on any given action, William the Conqueror had it in his power to invade England or not. The conquest was planned and executed by a single man, and there is the strongest reason to believe that the importance of that one man's choice, depended on the improvement of a single opportunity which, if lost, would never have recurred. If William had not conquered England, there is no sort of reason to suppose that any one of his sons would have done so. If, therefore, William I. had stayed at home, where would have been the conquest? If there had been no conquest, where would have been the sturdiness? If there had been no sturdiness, where would have been the scepticism? If there had been no scepticism, where would have been Adam Smith? It would seem that, after all, the writers and men of science are not quite so independent of statesmen and soldiers as Mr. Buckle would wish us to believe; and it would also appear that the rapidity with which men accumulate, and the intensity with which they desire knowledge, depend greatly on the degree in which they have been taught by politicians and political experience to act and think like free men.

It is unworthy of a man of Mr. Buckle's understanding to maintain seriously that the principal benefit which governments have conferred on civilisation is the prevention or punishment of crime. The importance of established authorities, legislatures, national churches, corporate professions, the public administration of justice, and the other great institutions which collectively constitute what we mean by the general name of the government, is in reality immeasurably great and various. We will point out a few of the particulars of which it consists, but the subject is capable of endless expansion and illustration. One of the most important functions which governments discharge is the production of national unity. It is no small or easy achievement to form a number of scattered societies into one body politic — to give them one voice and one set of interests, and to found the institutions by which that voice may be expressed, and those interests may be defended. This is



not one of the things which people will do for themselves; for it is well known that amongst the mass of mankind petty local prejudices and attachments are more powerful, not merely than philosophy, but than the clearest promptings of self-interest. The union between England and Scotland was intensely unpopular: Spain is to this day a geographical rather than a national unit, and we have no doubt that Mercia, Wessex, and East Anglia had each their local patriots, who withstood the centralising policy of Egbert and his successors. It was only out of opposition to England that British North America wished to coalesce with the United States; now that we have virtually emancipated Canada, the tide runs strongly in favour of independence of the Union, and it is more probable that the United States themselves will separate than that they will merge into a single body. If popular feeling does not usually tend to produce national unity, the mere accumulation of knowledge is equally powerless for the purpose. The Frankfort parliament, which tried the experiment, was perhaps the most ludicrous and the most learned failure that history has to record. One force, and one only, has been adequate to the task, and that is the power of a central government. Frederic II. actually did for part of Germany what the Frankfort professors tried to do for the whole of it. William the Conqueror, Edward I., Louis XI., and Louis XIV., were some of the great consolidators of the most compact and powerful of modern nations; and it is quite impossible to overrate the importance of the results which were produced by such means as they, and others like them, employed. It cannot be doubted that their undertakings were amongst the most important of the sources which contributed to the formation of the national character. We have seen how Mr. Buckle's own admissions involve this consequence in the case of William the Conqueror; but it is a consequence altogether inconsistent with the contempt which he takes every opportunity of expressing for men of action as compared with men of speculation.

We may, indeed, infer the importance of practical life from the fact, that men of the very highest powers have devoted, and continually do devote, their lives to the pursuit of its objects. We live for ourselves as well as for our posterity; and if generation after generation find a noble field for the highest faculties which they possess in conducting the affairs, in maintaining the rights, in rousing the spirit, in extending the power of a great nation, need we look further for a justification of the dignity of their pursuits? Is it any sort of objection, to say, that after all their

business is substantially the same in its objects and its principles as the business of their fathers was in their day. The object for which a man lives is not to heap up riches, physical and intellectual, for himself and his successors, but to do the work which lies before him. It is absurd and bigoted to resist change, to cling to what is old because it is old, to do what our ancestors did because they did it, or to refuse as opportunity offers to enlarge the circle of experience and to multiply relations with the world; but surely it is no less absurd and bigoted to look upon change as the one thing needful, as the one object of human wishes, and the one subject of human study.

A still more serious practical consequence of Mr. Buckle's views is to be found in their tendency to consequences of a directly immoral character. Mr. Buckle seems to us not only to undervalue morality theoretically, but also to misapprehend it in practice; and this is, we think, a direct consequence of his general views on the subject. It may not only be conceded, but it is the very foundation of our opinions upon this question, that neither morals nor theology have as yet, as Mr. Buckle would phrase it, 'been raised to the rank of sciences;' or, as we should say, they have not as yet been made the subjects of complete scientific demonstration. This is a proposition which can startle or offend no one of the most ordinary education. The great truths which lie at the bottom of all speculations upon these subjects are confessedly most mysterious. That is, they are very imperfectly apprehended, and offer a great number of intricate, perplexing, and (at present, at least) insoluble problems. There is, probably, no class of moralists or of divines who would not agree with us thus far. Let us consider what are the consequences of this state of things, on the principles advocated respectively by Mr. Buckle and by ourselves. Mr. Buckle's view of the matter is at once simple, characteristic, and intelligible. Science and superstition (p. 542.), in his view, make up a sort of intellectual plenum, and, therefore, nothing ought to be allowed to influence our conduct but what is scientifically ascertained. He does not indeed, carry out this doctrine to its full extent, nor does he even state it in so many words. He seems rather to hold that for the regulation of a man's private conduct, he may adopt principles which he would not be justified in carrying out into public life. With respect to theology, he says, 'Those sublime questions . . . . are for each according to the measure of his own soul, because they lie in that unknown tract which separates the Finite from the Infinite, and because they are as a

'secret and individual covenant between man and his God.' (P. 469.) But with respect to politics, he observes in his disquisition on the character of Burke, that inasmuch as politics are not yet reduced to a science, 'the proper business of a statesman is to contrive the means by which certain ends may be effected, leaving it to the general voice of the country to determine what those ends shall be, and shaping his own conduct, *not according to his own principles*, but according to the wishes of the people for whom he legislates, and whom he is bound to obey.' These two passages clearly illustrate Mr. Buckle's conception of the general bearing of theology and morality on the actual state of society. He seems to feel, that in the absence of scientific certainty upon these subjects, no institutions and no principles drawn from considerations relating to them can, or at least ought to exist. Obedience to the will of the majority in politics is for the present our best and highest course; individual and apparently solitary worship is the only reasonable form of religion. 'It would thus be our business carefully to eliminate from political life all appeal to any general principles, whether of morals or theology, and to expurgate our social institutions of every establishment, public or private, which rested in any degree on the recognition of such principles. This appears to us to be the result of Mr. Buckle's theory when reduced to practice. He does not, of course, state his views in this form; but such would seem on the whole to be their tendency — a tendency which displays itself in somewhat singular results, whenever he has occasion to express an opinion upon the character and conduct of individuals. Thus, in speaking of Henry IV., he observes, that 'to suit the shifting politics of his age, he had already changed his religion twice, and he did not hesitate to change it a third time, when he found that by doing so he could ensure tranquillity to his country;' and immediately afterwards he refers to Henry's 'enlightened principles.' In another place he tells us, that reverence 'is a compound of wonder and fear,' (a definition which would imply that the most worthy object of it is the devil,) and he appears to speak with distinct approbation of pride, of rebellion, and of heresy, of which latter virtues, he says, that they 'are but different forms of the same disregard of tradition, the same bold and independent spirit.' In short, he uniformly and pertinaciously refuses to estimate the worth of any man, or of any set of men, by reference to any other standard than one which determines the extent to which they have contributed to the accumulation of knowledge. The perfect and even unconscious consistency of such

expressions, with the whole tenor of Mr. Buckle's general theory of history, needs no illustration at our hands; the important question with respect to them is, whether they point to views in which all who agree with Mr. Buckle in believing morals and theology to be as yet in an unscientific state, must ultimately acquiesce. We entirely disbelieve it. We hold that, in political as well as in private morality — in theology, as well as in morals, — feelings, principles, and objects imperfectly realised, arranged, understood, and described, may and ought to influence our conduct most deeply. The 'sublime questions' involved in these matters may 'lie in the unknown tract between the 'finite and the infinite;' but is not this only a fine way of saying that we know very little about them? Did not astronomy and anatomy long lie in the same unknown tract, but, would it on that account have been wise to burn the unscientific or half scientific calendars, and to neglect the empirical medical rules which were in use long before our knowledge on these subjects had reached its present condition? Ptolemy and Tycho Brahe were not the equals of Copernicus and Newton; Sir Thomas Browne would have been a very bad substitute for Dr. Baillie; but their science, such as it was, furnished early navigators with many useful rules, prolonged many lives, and cured many diseases. We cannot make our own ignorance the measure of the external influences which affect us. The most ignorant man is as liable to be ill as the most learned physician. The earth does move round the sun, and carries us with it whether we know or admit it or not; and in just the same way, a man may do wrong, though he disavows morality, and may be wicked, though he does not believe in God. A man may know, or at any rate have strong grounds for supposing, that his health is subject to certain influences, though he cannot quite tell what they are; and in the same way we are justified in inferring from a thousand considerations that it is highly probable that moral right and wrong, national justice, faith, and honour, the laws of God, and other such phrases, have a most important meaning, though we cannot replace them by precise equivalents. If this is so, it is a tremendous risk to lay such considerations out of account in our conduct. To assume in practice that we are never to act with a view to principles imperfectly apprehended, would be as fatal to private as to public morality. If a politician is bound to carry out the will of the majority, every individual's passions must be a law to himself. If the question to be discussed is, whether the United States shall annex Cuba, whether England shall make war with China,

whether France shall conquer Belgium, does Mr. Buckle seriously mean to say that the only question which a statesman ought to entertain would be whether it was the deliberate wish of the nation to which he belonged to do these things, and if so, to do them without further inquiry? If he does, he may well despise politics, for no man of honour or conscience would consent to be engaged in them. Had all politicians been of this school, they would have been engaged in the foulest and bloodiest work that has ever disgraced this earth. They would have crucified the founder of Christianity, and have exterminated his followers; they would have made liberty and toleration impossible, and have torn the human race to pieces by ceaseless internecine warfare. Almost every war of conquest has been popular so long as it was successful, and in almost every country out of Europe and North America furious bigotry can hardly be said to sleep. It is hard to understand why Mr. Buckle allows to nations what he would probably deny to individuals. If the agent of a number of men may lawfully gratify their deliberate wish to rob or murder, why may not an individual do the same on his own account? If, on consulting that constituency of passions and desires which resides in my own heart, I find that they unanimously and pertinaciously vote for murder, why may not I give my assent to the proposed measure? My own interest is very much a matter of taste and opinion, and I am bound to consult the general interests of society only by those general unscientific considerations which in politics Mr. Buckle deliberately sets aside. Some principles of conduct we must have, and the principle that the deliberate wish of the majority is to be our guide, appears to us to be at once unscientific and disagreeable.

To us it appears to be indisputably clear that what we have called the working rules of life, the principles of theology and of morality usually received amongst us, though certainly not based on scientific observation or clothed in scientific language, do nevertheless contain a very large proportion of truth; so large a proportion that, though to inquire into and revise them is perhaps the highest function to which the human mind can devote itself, they afford rules quite exact enough to be of the greatest possible importance in regulating the public and private affairs of life, and principles which may well serve as the foundation for institutions most necessary and beneficial to mankind. A certain degree of intolerance and bigotry may be an inevitable result of such institutions, but these are evils infinitely small in comparison with the godlessness and grace-

lessness which would overspread the mass of society, if upon these matters each man stood entirely alone, acknowledging no other relation to his fellows than those which arise from interest or personal liking. Here and there a man of peculiar mental constitution may get more harm than good from advice or sympathy in matters of this kind; but such cases must be very rare indeed, and in providing for the interests of the mass of mankind they may safely be neglected.

Such is our view of the general doctrine of Mr. Buckle's most remarkable book. On the one hand, we do not think that he has succeeded in establishing the possibility of a science of human action; on the other, we do not believe that if such a science were shown to be possible, that fact would in any way weaken the foundations of morality or of religion; but we feel that the manner in which the subject is handled conveys a most natural impression that Mr. Buckle is of a contrary opinion; and we further think that, though the vigour and fearlessness with which he writes are worthy of the highest praise and respect, it is necessary to point out the degree in which his passion for viewing history as a whole, and for reducing the formulas by which it is to be described to the simplest possible expression, prevents him from paying proper attention to its moral characteristics, and sometimes even from appreciating their character. We are, however, far from wishing to confine our observations on Mr. Buckle's work to hostile or to dissentient criticism. To criticise in such a spirit what has been obviously the very able and conscientious labour of many years, must always be both unjust to the subject and dangerous to the author of the criticism. We do not agree with the main theory which Mr. Buckle so earnestly labours to enforce and illustrate, but we should be perfectly willing to agree with it if it were stated more narrowly. If he proposed to confine his scheme to an exposition of the nature of civilisation, considered as the process of acquiring and applying knowledge and wealth, and to a history of its effect on other branches of human affairs, we should willingly admit not only that he had undertaken a very important task, but that he had made an important step towards completing it. We quite allow that he illustrates with admirable power and compression the intimate connection between the scientific and the political history of the last century, both here and in France, and that he has thrown a fresh and original light on some passages in the literary annals of both countries. If Mr. Buckle should live to accomplish any considerable part of what he has

undertaken, he will not, we think, have furnished us with any formulas which will enable us to predict the future course of history, but he will have drawn a sort of intellectual map of many large and important provinces of human activity, the mutual relations of which are at present but very vaguely recognized even by those who have studied their respective importance most carefully. He will have given us an inventory of our resources, the value of which in many ways can hardly be exaggerated. He will have shown what the width and depth of the issues raised by political events really is, and will have enabled men to see, that when they commit themselves to tyranny, they commit themselves to ignorance; that when they shrink from the cares and the burden of freedom, they shrink from science and from truth. These are no doubt great results, and the man who can look forward to obtaining them is no common man. We are satisfied that the discussion he has provoked will not be permanently injurious to the eternal landmarks of human action and human belief; and we recommend this book to the consideration of our readers, though we do not believe that Englishmen will ever accept its doctrine or adopt its conclusions.

- ART. VIII. — 1. *A Journey through the Kingdom of Oude in 1849-50, by direction of the Right Honourable the Earl of Dalhousie, Governor-General; with Private Correspondence relative to the Annexation of Oude to British India, &c.* By Major-General Sir W. H. SLEEMAN, K.C.B., Resident at the Court of Lucknow. 2 vols. 1858.
2. *A Personal Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow, from its Commencement to its Relief by Sir Colin Campbell.* By L. E. RUUTZ REES, one of the surviving defenders. London: 1858.

WHEN first we took occasion in October, 1855, to direct public attention to the Court and Government of Oude, as portrayed in a little volume, then recently published under the title of 'The Private Life of an Eastern King,' the extraordinary nature of those disclosures, the systematic violation of justice, decency, and humanity at Lucknow, the nameless outrages perpetrated by the minions of the Court, and the total anarchy prevailing in the country under the shadow of British protection, raised a suspicion that these charges were overcoloured, and that the tale partook of the character of an Eastern romance. We knew, however, that these facts were true; and we took that opportunity of pointing out the impossibility of maintaining such a state of things, or of suffering it to last. Subsequent events have given a very high degree of importance to this subject, both as regards the policy and character of the British Government in India, and in connexion with the revolt of the Bengal army. But the case admitted of far stronger statements than those put forward by the author of the little volume then before us. These statements are now published in an authentic form from the papers of Sir William Sleeman himself, late Resident at the Court of Lucknow; and we do not remember to have met with any work which gives so faithful or so frightful an account of the effects of Native Indian Government, or which contains so much original information to explain the events that have recently astonished the world.

It may be questioned whether the absorption of Oude into the British territories contributed directly to the great mutiny of 1857; but there cannot be the slightest doubt, that indirectly the condition of Oude, the ferocity of its chiefs, the warlike habits of the people, the fanaticism of its castes, and the hatred which prevails in that province against the restraints of law and government, did promote the insurrection, and served to



render Oude the rallying point of the disaffected, and the arena of a protracted resistance. That the tract of country which has been the shortest time under British rule should be that in which the movement against our authority would most nearly resemble a popular outbreak, was assuredly to have been expected. We need not seek for any explanation of the fact beyond the range of the most obvious suggestions of our ordinary experience. If there had been nothing anarchical and exceptional in the social condition of the country, we could still have understood the natural impatience of the people under a newly-imposed yoke. But when we read these recent events by the light thrown upon them by this publication of Colonel Sleeman's official tour in Oude in the years 1849 and 1850, we see at once that it would have been little short of a miracle, if the military revolt in the adjacent provinces had not roused into intense action that spirit of resistance to constituted authority, which had grown with the growth and strengthened with the strength of the great landholders of Oude.

During long years, this intolerable grievance of baronial lawlessness had been eating into the very life of the State. It had humiliated and impoverished the Government, and had inflicted incalculable misery upon the people. Over all parts of the country—up to the very palace gates,—the might of the great territorial lords had been the law of the land. They had successfully resisted the authority of the king, and they had robbed and murdered their weaker neighbours without punishment and without control. They had extended their possessions by tyrannical usurpation, and had seldom paid to the public treasury more than a third of the government dues. Appalling were the crimes committed by these magnates, and measureless the sufferings which they inflicted upon the people. But although the necessary result of their lawlessness was a diminution of the resources of the State, the State never addressed itself seriously to the work of grappling with the evil. There was money enough at Lucknow for the king and for his parasites. It mattered little that for all purposes of beneficent administration the powers of the Crown were crippled by the robberies of the landholders. The king had the means of unlimited indulgence. The minister grew rich upon corruption. The eunuchs, the fiddlers, the singers, the dancing girls, *mendicants, mimæ, balatrones, hoc genus omne*, rioted and revelled around the regal sensualist, and by their baneful influence over the besotted and enfeebled mind of the sovereign, they usurped the whole power of Government.

Saadut Ali Khan, the Nawab of Oude, with whom Lord

Wellesley concluded the treaty of 1801, reigned from 1797 to 1814. He was a man of great discernment and ability, who endeavoured to keep down the landed aristocracy, and to administer the law. He reduced the army from 80,000 to 30,000 men; he resumed many of the estates granted by the prodigality of his predecessors; and such was his economy, that on his death he left fourteen millions sterling in the treasury, which he found empty on his accession. But each succeeding ruler of the country who has followed this able sovereign—and there have been five kings of Oude in the space of forty years,—seems to have surpassed the recklessness, the vices, the crimes; and the political incapacity of his immediate predecessor, until the last king systematically refused to take any cognizance whatever of public affairs, and abandoned them altogether to the most profligate ministers. In a note written in 1851, Colonel Sleeman says:—

‘This systematic disregard of his high duties and responsibilities still continues to be manifested by the King of Oude, and is observed with feelings of indignation and abhorrence by his well-disposed subjects of all classes and grades, who are thereby left to the mercy of men without any feeling of security in their tenure of office, any scruples of conscience, or feelings of humanity or of honour. So inveterate is the system of misgovernment—so deeply are all those now concerned in the administration interested in maintaining its worst abuses—and so fruitless is it to expect the king ever to remove them, or employ better men, that the impression has become strong and general, that our Government can no longer support the present Government of Oude, without seriously neglecting its duty towards the people.’ (Vol. ii. p. 206.)

Yet the existing treaties between the Court of Oude and the Indian Government contained no provision for the direct interference of the British authorities in the event of gross and continued maladministration, though by requiring the instant presence of a portion of the British troops in Oude, they gave increased facilities to oppression. The influence exercised by the Resident was indirect, and it was utterly insufficient to check the daily commission of atrocious acts of brutality and injustice by the Princes who owed their throne to the liberality and forbearance of the East India Company, or to punish the violence and insubordination of the nobles who exulted in the weakness of the native government.

It was an old story, when in the cold weather of 1849-50, Colonel Sleeman undertook the official tour, the record of which forms the substance of these interesting volumes. Many had been the reports, couched in more general language, which

former Residents had forwarded to the Supreme Government of India—reports setting forth that these great talookdars or landholders dwelt in fortified places, with mounted guns, and large bodies of retainers; that they were continually giving battle to, and generally repulsing, the king's troops, making armed incursions into the estates of their weaker neighbours, and expelling them with fire and sword, sometimes varying the excitement of these foreign wars by desperate internal strife—son rising against father, or brother against brother, and committing cold-blooded murder upon their nearest kindred with every aggravation of treachery and cruelty of the deepest dye. All this had been duly reported to Governor-General after Governor-General, and repeated warnings had been given to the indolent and sensual rulers, from the days of Lord Wellesley to those of Lord Hardinge, when, during the viceroyalty of the successor of the latter nobleman, Colonel Sleeman started upon a tour through the province, determined to see and to judge for himself, and to record the results of his daily observations for the information of Lord Dalhousie.

The volumes before us are the results of this official journey. Having jotted down his information from day to day, Colonel Sleeman found, on his return to Lucknow, that he was in possession of a vast mass of materials, out of which a report upon the general condition of Oude might, with little trouble, be framed. But even this little trouble would have been thrown away—nay, indeed, it might have been worse than useless; for the digested official report would probably have afforded to the Government a less lively conception of the actual state of the country than the cruder records of the actual journey, with the vivid impressions of a present reality upon every page. The diary, therefore, with but little alteration, was privately printed, by Colonel Sleeman, at Lucknow; and a few copies only struck off at a 'parlour press'—the first work of any magnitude, in the English language, ever printed in that capital. One of these copies was sent to the Government of India, and forwarded to the Court of Directors of the East India Company, as an enclosure to a public despatch. The journal was, therefore, in every sense, an official document; and Colonel Sleeman himself entered a *caveat* on that score, in a notice which he prefixed to the privately-printed copies, stating that the contents of the volume could be made public only with the consent of the Government. In 1856, Colonel Sleeman—or General Sir William Sleeman, K.C.B., as he then was, for he had attained to high rank and honour since the journal was written—died on his way to England. Whether, had he survived, he would have sought

permission from the Government to give this journal to the world we have no means of knowing; but, after his death, it might have long lain in the dignified obscurity of the Company's Record-office, but for the very Government which we perceive has been accused of endeavouring to prevent its publication. The journal is now published, not only with the consent of the Court of Directors, but at the suggestion, as we are informed, of gentlemen connected with the government of the East India Company. For our own parts, indeed, it is a source of astonishment to us that any one, whatever may be his opinion of the secretiveness of the East India Company, should suppose that there could be any dishonest intention to suppress a document, the publication of which goes so far to justify the course they pursued in annexing Oude to the British dominions.

We can hardly imagine any testimony more valuable than that of such a man as Colonel Sleeman. His sympathies, in a large and tolerant yet discriminating sense, were with the people of India. He was, perhaps, the very last man in the country to endeavour to make out a case against native prince or people. No man knew better—no man perhaps so well, the depths of human depravity to which, under the influence of gross ignorance and debasing superstition, the inhabitants of India could descend; for he had mastered the whole science of Thuggee, and laid bare its abominations to the world. But he compassionated the people whilst he abhorred their vices; and no man was ever more prompt to recognise or more delighted to dwell upon the better aspects of the native character. His humanity, indeed, was of the very finest temper. He sought for good wheresoever it was to be found. Thoroughly acquainted with the native languages, and, in a very unusual manner, with the habits and the usages, the opinions and the feelings of all classes of the people, he had lived, during the greater part of his life, in constant intercourse with them, and was never so happy as when he was conversing with them, and adding to his stores of information whatsoever he believed could some day be employed to their advantage. He was continually seeking, indeed, to do good to the people among whom his lot had been cast. But he was not one of those who measure all things by English rule and compass, and who look upon English laws and English systems of government as the only remedies for the evils which are preying upon the country. He had a horror of what he called the 'new school' of systematic annexationists; and an unfailing respect for the existing rights and privileges of all classes of the native population, from the princes in the palace to the peasants in the mud hut. He never sought a pretext for putting forth the

strong hand of the paramount power, but was rather disposed, on the other side, to extenuate the evils and to apologise for the crimes which seemed to call for our interference. He is, therefore, as we have said, the man of all others whose testimony regarding the condition of Oude, under its native rulers, is to be received with respect. He understood the people of the country too well, and was too much in the habit of weighing evidence, to be himself deceived; and he was too just and too tolerant a man, too little prejudiced against native systems, to have distorted or exaggerated a single fact brought before him in the course of his journey. If the actual state of Oude, in 1850, was not worse than it is represented to be in Colonel Sleeman's volumes, we may at least feel certain that it was in no degree better.

It was on the 1st of December, 1849, that Colonel Sleeman, having formally taken leave of the king, left Lucknow and commenced his tour 'to see the state of the country and the condition of the people.' He was accompanied by his wife and children, by two or three officers attached to the Residency, and by two companies of sepoys for his escort. On the following day he made this entry in his journal:—

'The two pergunnahs of Newabgunge and Sidhore are under the charge of Aga Ahmud, the Amil, who has under him two Naibs or deputies. All three are obliged to connive at the iniquities of a landholder, Gholam Huzrut, who resides on his small estate of Jhareecoopora, which he is augmenting in a manner too common in Oude, by seizing on the estates of his weaker neighbours. He wanted to increase the number of his followers, and on the 10th of November, 1849, he sent some men to aid the prisoners in the great gaol at Lucknow to break out. Five of them were killed in the attempt, seven were wounded, and twenty-five were retaken; but forty-five escaped, and among them Fuzl Ali, who, in April, 1847, cut down the late minister Ameer-ood-dowlah, in the midst of his followers, in one of the principal streets of Lucknow.' (Vol. i. p. 2.)

In this passage, which occurs in the second page of the journal, the keynote of the whole book is struck. 'Gholam Huzrut,' we are told, a little further on, 'has two forts, to which he retires when pursued, and a good many powerful landholders, always ready to support him against the Government, on condition of being supported by him when necessary.' On the next day's march, the tourist skirted the lands of another model landholder, of whom we have the following account:—

'The village of Kinallee is now in the estate of Radinagur. Dhu-  
mra, held by Gorbukah, a large landholder, who has a strong  
at Bhithole, at the point of the delta formed by the Chouka and  
Shogra rivers, which here unite. He has taken refuge, with some

four thousand armed followers, in this fort, under the apprehension of being made to pay the full amount of the government demand, and called to account for the rescue of some atrocious offenders from Captain Hearsey, of the Frontier Police, by whom they had been secured. Gorbuksh used to pay two hundred thousand rupees a year, but for the last three years he has not paid the rate to which he has got it reduced, of one hundred and fifty thousand. Out of his rent and the revenues due to Government, he keeps up a large body of armed followers, to intimidate the Government, and seize upon the estates of his weaker neighbours, many of which he has lately appropriated by fraud, violence, and collusion. An attempt was this year made to put this estate under the management of Government officers; but he was too strong for the Government, which was obliged to temporise, and at last to yield. He is said to exact from the landholders the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand rupees a year. He holds also the estate of Bhitolee at the apex of the delta of the Ghagra and Chouka rivers, in which the fort of Bhitolee is situated. The government demand on this estate is fifty thousand rupees a year. His son, Jurubjeet Sing, is engaged in plunder, and it is said with his father's connivance and encouragement, though he pretends to be acting in disobedience of his orders. The object is to augment their estate, and intimidate the Government and its officers, by gangs of ruffians, whom they can subsist only by plunder and malversation. The greater part of the lands comprised in this estate of Ramnuggur Dhumeereca, of which Rajah Gorbuksh is now the local governor, are hereditary possessions which have been held by his family for many generations. A part has been recently seized from weaker neighbours, and added to them. The rest are merely under him as the governor or public officer, entrusted with the collection of the revenue and the management of the police.

A little further on, the tourist (December 5.) was met by one of the native collectors of the district, who complained of the difficulties experienced in realising the just demands of the Exchequer, 'from the number and power of the talookdars of the districts, who had forts and bands of armed followers too strong for the King's officers.' In one small pergunnah, it was stated that there were six of these talookdars, each with a fort mounting five or six guns, and 'trained bands of armed and brave men of five or six hundred, which they augment as occasion requires.'

The effect of this continual warfare upon the cultivation of the country was such as might be expected. The natural productiveness of the soil, however, is so great, that under more favourable auspices the whole province would be a garden; and those tracts which were under the undisputed sway of the strong iron-handed landowners afforded always flattering contrasts to the lands of their weaker neighbours, exposed to these continual incursions:—

‘The hereditary possessions of the talookdars and, indeed, all the lands, in the permanent possession of which they feel secure, are commonly very well cultivated; but those which they acquire by fraud, violence or collusion, are not so, till by long suffering and hope deferred, the old proprietors have been effectually crushed, or driven out of the country.’

‘To be weak is to be miserable—doing or suffering’—and to be the cause of misery to others. Hence we are told that,—

‘If a weak man, by favour, fraud, or collusion, gets possession of a small estate, as he often does, the consequences are more serious than where the strong man gets it. The ousted proprietors fight to the death to recover possession; and the new man forms a gang of the most atrocious ruffians he can collect, to defend his possessions. He cannot afford to pay them, and permits them to subsist on plunder. In the contest the estate itself and many around it become waste, and the fellow who has usurped it often, *volens volens*, becomes a systematic leader of banditti; and converts the deserted villages into strongholds and dens of robbers.’

‘The cases of atrocious murders and robberies which came before me every day, and are acknowledged by the local authorities and neighbours of the sufferers to have taken place, are frightful. Such sufferings, for which no redress is to be found, would soon desolate any part of India less favoured by nature . . . . If a landholder takes to rebellion and plunder, he is followed by all his retainers and clansmen, and their families, and the cultivators of other classes, feeling no longer secure, go and till lands on other estates till they are invited back. The cowherds and shepherds, who live by the produce of their cattle and sheep, remain and thrive by the abundance of pasture lands, from which the rich spring and harvest crops have disappeared. These cattle and sheep graze over them and enrich the soil by restoring to it a portion of those elements of fertility, of which a long succession of harvests had robbed it. . . . The landholder and his followers, in the meantime, enrich themselves by the indiscriminate plunder of the surrounding country; and are at last invited back by a weak and wearied Government, to reoccupy the lands, improved by this salutary fallow, at a lower rate of rent, or no rent at all for some years, and a remission of all balances for past years, on account of *Nae-malee*, or treading down of crops during the disorder that has prevailed.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 42, 43.)

Of the extent to which this great evil affected both the political and social condition of the country, some idea may be formed after a perusal of the following brief, but significant passage. It is computed that these great landholders had in their pay an aggregate armed force, equal in numbers to the state army twice told:—

‘In Oude, these great landholders have, at present, about two hundred and fifty mud forts, mounting about five hundred guns, and

containing on an average four hundred armed men, or a total of one hundred thousand, trained and maintained to fight against (each) other, or against the Government authorities; and to pillage the peaceful and industrious around wherever so employed. In the half of the Oude territory ceded to us in 1801, this class of armed retainers has disappeared altogether. Hence from the Oude half, we have some fifty thousand native officers and sepoy in our native army, while from our half we have not perhaps five thousand.' (Vol. ii. p. 210.)

'In Oude, and indeed in all other parts of India, under a Government so weak and indifferent to the sufferings of its subjects, all men who consider arms to be their proper profession, think themselves justified in using them to extort the means of subsistence from those who have property when they have none, and can no longer find suitable employment. All Rajpoots are of this class, and the greater part of the landholders in Oude are Rajpoots.'

The whole country, therefore, became an ambuscade, covered with mud forts garrisoned by gangs of robbers.

'Even the children in the villages play at fortifications as a favourite amusement, each striving to catch the other in the ingenuity of his defences. They all seem to feel that they must some day take a part in defending such places against the king's troops; and the parents seem to encourage the feeling. The real mud forts are concealed from sight in beautiful clusters of bamboos, or other evergreen jungle, so that the passer-by can see nothing of them. Some of them are exceedingly strong against troops unprovided with mortars and shells. The garrison is easily shelled out by a small force, or starved out by a large one; but one should never attempt to breach them with round-shot, or take them by an escalade or a rush.'

The possession of these mud forts depends in great measure on the jungles which surround them. There are no less than twenty-four belts of jungle in Oude, covering an extent of 886 square miles. They are all upon the finest soil, and in the finest climate, but created and preserved by the landholders, for the express purpose of sheltering their arbitrary power from the control of the Government.

This is sufficient in itself to explain the character of the war which has been for many months raging in Oude. A hundred thousand of these stout 'barons' retainers,' with matchlocks and tulwars, are not to be put down in a day. They were too strong for their own government, which was compelled sometimes to seek the aid of British troops for their subjection. But, although these robber-lords had thus been frequently driven from their strongholds and their fortresses destroyed, they soon found the means of restoring their fastnesses and recruiting their military strength:—



‘The aid of British troops in the collection of the revenues of Oude has long ceased to be afforded ; but when they have been afforded for the suppression of leaders of atrocious bands of robbers, who preyed upon the people and seized upon the lands of their weaker neighbours, and they have been driven from their forts and strongholds, the privilege of building them up again, or reoccupying and garrisoning them with the same bands of robbers, to be employed in the same way, is purchased from the local authorities, or the patrons of these leaders at court, during the same or the succeeding season. The same things continue to be done every season where no British troops are employed.’ (Vol. ii. p. 209.)

Indeed, the most powerful of the great territorial rebels were those who found the greatest favour at court. They had larger means of corruption, and as they were capable of giving greater trouble than their neighbours, it was more important to conciliate them. Colonel Sleeman explains this in the following passage :—

‘It is worthy of remark, that the great landholders, who have recently acquired their possessions by the plunder and murder of their weaker neighbours, and who continue their system of pillage, in order to acquire the means to maintain their gangs, and add to their possessions, are those who are most favoured at Court, and most conciliated by the local rulers ; because they are more able and more willing than others to pay for the favour of the one, and set at defiance the authority of the other. They often get their estates transferred from the jurisdiction of the local governors to the person in charge of the Huzoor Tuhseel at Lucknow . . . . If the local governor reports their atrocities to Government, this person represents it as arising from enmity, and describes the sufferers as lawless characters whom it is meritorious to punish. If the Court attempts to punish or coerce such characters, he gives them information and does all he can to frustrate the attack. If they are taken and imprisoned, he soon gets them released, and if their forts and strongholds have been taken and pulled down, he sells them the privilege of rebuilding or repairing them. It is exceedingly difficult at all times, and often altogether impossible, to get one of these robber landholders punished, or effectually put down, so many and so formidable are the obstacles thrown in the way by the Court favourite, who has charge of the Huzoor Tuhseel, and their other friends at the capital. Those who suffer from their crimes have seldom any chance of redress. Having lost their all, they are no longer in a condition to pay for it ; and without payment nothing can be got from the Court of Lucknow.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 245.)

With one more extract from Colonel Sleeman’s most interesting and instructive volumes we conclude our illustrations :—

‘I do not think that any landholders of this class, in the Bangur districts, would feel much compunction for the commission of any crime that did not involve their expulsion from caste, or degradation

in rank. Great crimes do not involve these penalties: they receive them only by small peccadillos, or offences deemed venal among other societies. The Government of Oude, as it is at present constituted, will never be able to put down effectually the great crimes which now stain almost every acre of land in its dominions. It is painful to pass over a country abounding so much in what the evil propensities of our nature incite men to do, when not duly restrained; and so little in what the good prompt us to perform and create, when duly protected and encouraged, 'under good Governments.'— (Vol. ii. p. 30.)

These facts, which might be largely extended, appear to us to establish the proposition that when Lord Dalhousie was at last driven to that active interference in the state of Oude which had been so often threatened, and was at last so reluctantly undertaken, the task of the British Government of India was not merely to depose a dynasty, but to change the whole condition of society. The removal of a vicious sovereign or a corrupt minister, or the introduction of rulers animated with nobler motives, could have led to no result at all, unless the strength of the British authority was vigorously exerted to crush these abuses, to dismantle these forts, to disperse these gangs of robbers, to root up these jungles, to disarm these marauders, and to establish the law. No native power could by possibility have been equal to such an undertaking. But the welfare of the people and the safety of India required that it should be performed. It could only be performed by the British Government; and placed in this alternative, we adhere to the opinion that the engagements entered into with the reigning family of Oude—repeatedly violated as they had been by themselves—were not of a nature to outweigh the duty we owed to the country at large, and to the interests of humanity itself. To maintain the nominal sovereignty of the Oude princes, while all real power was taken away from them, would have been a mere fiction, quite unworthy of the British Government.

We therefore see no reason to modify the opinion we expressed even before the measure of annexation was actually taken. But the greater the task, and the greater the necessity of performing it, the more incumbent was it on the Government of India to take ample and judicious means of accomplishing it. In this respect we are by no means satisfied that very serious errors, both military and civil, have not been committed. The facility with which the measure was carried into effect at the moment it was resolved upon, seems to have misled the Governor-General. Yet it was obvious that resistance was to be anticipated, not from the corrupt and debile Court of Lucknow,

but from the landed proprietors with whom the new Government must shortly be brought into collision. What was done to provide against this danger? The amount of European troops which could be brought into Oude was ludicrously small. The Bengal sepoys who formed the British garrison were themselves natives of Oude, connected in a hundred ways with the people against whom they might be called on to act. It is said that a proposal to exchange these troops for Sikh regiments from the Punjaub, was declined. Above all, no attempt was made to construct fortified cantonments or citadels to overawe the country, to keep Lucknow itself in check, and to protect the feeble garrison from a *coup de main*. As far as we are aware, no one seems to have considered what the military position of the British forces in Oude really was; for had it been considered, the merest tyro in the art of war could not have left them in so helpless a situation.

Nor does it appear that the observation of the first civil administrators of the country was much more acute. But continued success had caused the English in India to think lightly of such difficulties; and they set hopefully to work, confident in their ability to reduce all this chaotic mass of lawlessness to order, and to evolve peace and plenty out of strife and desolation. They did not expect to change the natures of men in a day; but they hoped to excite new interests, and, by asserting the authority of a strong and resolute government, to arouse new fears in the breasts of evil-doers, and so at once to encourage and alarm the people as they had never been encouraged or alarmed under their native government.

But it was not easy to reduce this hazardous theory to practice. Time might have accomplished it for us; but any mismanagement at the threshold might deprive us of the assistance of that ally. It was necessary to tread firmly, but cautiously at the outset of this undertaking; and most of all, to set about the work with a thorough knowledge of the materials out of which the future government of the province was to be composed. All violent assumptions and hasty conclusions, derived less from actual information than from forced analogies, were to be especially avoided. It is true that only a few years before, the turbulent Sikh nation had been converted into peaceable British subjects; and that everything had gone well in the Punjaub. But Oude was not a conquered country, and the Lawrences were not there to manage the difficult work of annexation.

Much, indeed, depended upon the man. But scarcely had Oude been proclaimed a British province, when Sir James Outram,

who had succeeded Colonel Sleeman as Resident at Lucknow, and on the annexation of the province had been appointed Chief Commissioner, was compelled to return, in broken health, but with unbroken energy, to England. Sir Henry Lawrence was then in Rajpootana. He saw that there was work to be done in Oude; and he knew that much depended on the officer placed, especially under a new Governor-General, in charge of the newly-assumed administration of such a province as Oude. He therefore tendered his services to Government, declaring his willingness to take upon himself the management of affairs during the absence of Outram from his post. This offer came too late. The letter did not reach Calcutta until another had been appointed to 'officiate' as Chief Commissioner of Oude.

The officer thus appointed was a civilian, an experienced revenue officer; a man of undoubted energy and ability, but not well qualified for the work of settling a new province. 'Experienced revenue officers' are too keen to manage a transition period with success. They detect flaws with too much acumen, and they apply the screw with too tight a hand. What is most required in such a conjuncture is a wise toleration. We believe, therefore, that it was a misfortune that Sir Henry Lawrence did not, in the early part of 1857, succeed Sir James Outram in the charge of the administration of Oude.

Wise after the event, we see clearly now what were the dangers which threatened the Government of India in the first years of its rule in Oude. In the first place, there was a large body of disbanded soldiery—thousands of armed men let loose upon the country, with no prospective means of subsistence except by plunder—an army of 60,000 men, clamouring for arrears of pay due to them by the native Government. The Government paid those arrears in whole or in part; it took a small proportion of the men into its own service, and dismissed the remainder with either small pensions or gratuities. The result appeared to be all that could be desired. The Oude army was broken up quietly; men went to their homes, or it was believed that they went to their homes; and for a time nothing more was heard about them. The Government of India then leapt hastily to the conclusion that the danger was at an end. In fact, it had not commenced. The disbanded soldiery were held in a state of temporary quiescence by two accidental but transient circumstances. The first of these was the possession of the money which they had received from the British authorities; the second was the presence of a large body of British troops. Until the money was spent and the troops were withdrawn there was little or no real danger from this source of disquietude.

But the money spent and the troops withdrawn, there was abundant cause for alarm in the dispersion of these 40,000 fighting men over the length and breadth of the land.

The second source of peril was that curse of the great landholders, so graphically depicted in the pages of Colonel Sleeman's book. This also was a danger not likely to break out into full activity on the first assumption of the management of the country. The landholders, indeed, were held in restraint much in the same way as the disbanded soldiers; the transition state was temporarily advantageous to them, and the presence of a large body of British troops rendered any resistance to our authority hazardous in the extreme. They cared for the change of government only so far as it affected their own interests. The first great question of immediate concern to them, which pressed for practical solution, was the manner in which the new Government would deal with the outstanding balances due to the Oude treasury. Would the British begin a new score, or would they enforce payment of what was due to their predecessors? The question was soon settled by our statesmen, and on the most intelligible principle of fair debit-and-credit. The British Government, having taken upon itself the liabilities of its predecessor, was clearly entitled to the available assets; and among these assets was the unpaid revenue due from the landholders. The new administration had paid off arrears with one hand, and had full right to exact them with the other. There was no class of men less entitled to participate in its generosity than these rebellious chiefs; but it might not, on that account, have been less politic to conciliate them,—at all events to keep them quiet whilst our officers were feeling their way towards the entire settlement of the country. The balances, however, were exacted, and we do not hear that, except in one notorious case, any resistance was offered to British authority. The Rajah of Toolsepoore—of whom mention will be found in Colonel Sleeman's volume, and whom Mr. Rees states to have since died in captivity—hoisted the standard of rebellion, and was hunted down by a British revenue officer with a party of sepoy at his back. The first instance of our mode of dealing with a refractory zemindar was distinguished by promptitude and vigour, to which he and his brethren were but little accustomed; his person was seized, his followers were disbanded, and his estate was sequestered. The issue of the contest, we have no doubt, was watched with extreme interest by all the great landholders of Oude. It was not encouraging; so the landholders sunk into a state of sullen quiescence and bided their time. But the danger was not the less present because its activity was temporarily suspended.

Thus it was, that as a very necessity of the assumption of the administration, the Government of India, had arrayed in hostility against itself the territorial aristocracy of the country, and had scattered over the land thousands of desperate bandits, who, driven from the service of the State, were constrained to find congenial employment in a less legitimate direction; many of them, doubtless, taking service among the retainers of the great talookdars. These were sources of danger well understood by the authorities both in India and in England.\* But there was another, of which but little account was taken. Indeed, it was regarded rather as an element of safety than as a cause of alarm. Oude was the home of the British sepoy. A large portion of the Bengal army was drawn from the province. Their families dwelt there whilst they were on service; they visited their native villages from time to time on furlough; and they retired to them in old age, to spend their pensions and to send their sons to serve in their place. Now, these sepoy families in Oude constituted a privileged class under the old native government. They were especially protected by the British Resident. They had the privilege of presenting all their petitions, and of having all their suits adjusted, through that functionary. 'This privilege,' writes Colonel Sleeman, who bitterly deplored what he could not remedy, 'which the native officers and sepoy of our native army enjoy of petitioning for the redress of grievances through the Resident, has now been extended to all the regular, irregular, and local corps of the three presidencies, that is, to all corps paid by the British Government, and to all native officers and sepoy, and contingent corps employed in and paid by native States, who were drafted into them from the regular corps of our army, up to a certain time; and the number cannot be less than sixty thousand.' How the privilege arose—whence its origin, no one seems clearly to know. 'It is not,' Colonel Sleeman says, 'recognised or named in any treaty or other engagement with the Sovereign of Oude; nor does any one know its origin, for it cannot be found in any document recorded in the Resident's office.'

---

\* For example, the Court of Directors observe, in their published letter of 10th December, 1856, reviewing the circumstances attending the annexation of Oude:—'Respecting the peaceable demeanour, in this crisis, of the great bulk of the people, we entertained no doubts or misgivings; but there were two influential classes whose behaviour in such a conjuncture might have proved a source of considerable inconvenience—namely, the great zemindars and the soldiery.'

It was, indeed, simply an abuse, and one, too, of a very grievous character; for as the sepoy generally got more than their due, others got less; and the people of the country were the real sufferers by it. Even when the suits of the sepoys were against the Government officers, or the great landholders, upon questions of rent, a decision favourable to the sepoys was sure to be felt by the unprivileged cultivators, who were made to pay the amounts, and probably more than the amounts, lost to their landlords by the adverse judgment. The privilege in its recognised shape extended not only to the sepoys themselves, but to the immediate members of their family -- that is, to their wives, their fathers, their mothers, their sons, and their daughters. But practically it went beyond this. Colonel Sleeman assures us that although the sepoys 'cannot petition through the Resident for the redress of wrongs suffered, or pretended to have been suffered, by any other relations,' it has become a common custom with them to lend or sell their names to more remote relations, or to persons not related to them at all; and he adds, —

'The petition is made out in their own name, and the real sufferer, or pretended sufferer, who is to prosecute the claim, is named as the mooktyar or attorney.' A great many bad characters have in this way deprived men of lands which their ancestors had held in undisputed right of property for many generations or centuries; for the Court, to save themselves from the importunity of the Residency, has often given orders for the claimant being put in possession of the lands without due inquiry or any inquiry at all. The sepoys are in consequence much dreaded by the people among whom they reside, for there really is no class of men from whom it is more difficult to get the truth, in any shape. . . . Claims to villages, to which the claimants had really no right whatever, have been successfully prosecuted, by or through sepoys, for the sole purpose of having them transferred to the Huzoor Tuhseel, and made dens of thieves and highway robbers. . . . The privilege is attended with infinite difficulty and perplexity to the Resident and the Government; and is, at the same time, exceedingly obnoxious to the people and Government of Oudé.'

'Such a potent instrument, indeed, of extortion and aggrandisement was this privilege, that many men enlisted into the Company's service, 'with the view of better prosecuting their claims,' and resigned or deserted as soon as they had gained their object, and found the privilege had ceased to be of use to them. The personation of sepoys, too, by men who had never been a day in our service, was no uncommon thing. The trade, indeed, was a very lucrative one. Colonel Sleeman tells us of one Gholam Thelanee, a shopkeeper of Lucknow, who, seeing the profits derived by sepoys from the abuse of the privilege, pur-

chased a cavalry uniform — jacket, cap, pantaloons, boots, and sword; and, pretending to be an invalid sepoy, forwarded numerous petitions through the Resident, and found the trade so profitable that he carried it on for fifteen years. At last he got possession of an estate to which he had no sort of right, and soon afterwards sent in a petition complaining that the dispossessed proprietor had killed four of his relatives and turned him out. An inquiry was then instituted into the matter, and all the circumstances of the fraud elicited. ‘If,’ said the Resident of the day, reporting the case to Government, ‘a person known to thousands in the city of Lucknow is able for fifteen years to carry on such a trade successfully, how much more easy must it be for people in the country, not known to any in the city, to carry it on,’ without detection? The amount of misery inflicted upon the people by this crying abuse may be estimated by a reference to another anecdote recorded in these pages. A sepoy went one day to Captain Shakespear, assistant to the Resident, clamouring for justice, and loudly declaring that no notice had been taken of his petition. On inquiry, it appeared that no less than forty persons had been seized and cast into prison on his requisition; and yet he could not persuade himself that anything had been done to further his suit.

On the assumption by the British Government of the administration of Oude, this gigantic abuse necessarily ceased. There were no longer any privileged classes. There was no longer a British Resident. Equal justice was administered to all. What the sepoys lost the people gained; and, doubtless, the aggregate result of the change was extremely advantageous to Oude. But it swelled the ranks of those ‘dangerous classes,’ whose enmity was laying up for us a store of future tribulation. And this source of evil was all the more perilous, because it was, of all others, the one least likely to be perceived, and, if perceived, the most difficult to be guarded against. The British Government had clearly a right to think that whatever might be the feelings of the unprivileged people of Oude, high and low, towards their new rulers, its own servants and its own pensioners would be loyal to their ‘salt.’ We now learn that ‘officers who have to pass through Oude in their travels or sporting excursions have of late years generally complained that they receive less civility from villages in which our invalid and furlough sepoys are located than from any others; and that if they are anywhere treated with actual disrespect, such sepoys are generally found to be either the perpetrators or instigators.’ ‘This complaint,’ adds Colonel Sleeman, ‘is not, I fear, altogether unfounded; and may arise from the diminished attachment felt by the



‘sepoys for their European officers in our army, and partly from the privilege of urging their claims through the Resident, enjoyed by native officers and sepoy, and ceasing on their being transferred to the invalid establishment.’

But pregnant with danger as was the state of things which necessarily followed upon the assumption of the administration of Oude—dangers from the disbanded soldiery and from the refractory talookdars, the Government had excited only the antagonism of certain powerful classes. There was no ground for popular discontent. On the contrary, indeed, the privileged persons whose influence had been so grievously curtailed, were the enemies and the oppressors of the people. The interposition of a strong government was favourable to the security and the prosperity of the population at large; and it appears to have been the chief care of the English administrators to advance the happiness of the industrial classes without much regard to the vested interests of the dominant few who had ridden rough-shod over them with impunity under the government of their native princes. It would have been wiser to proceed, at the outset, either with greater caution or with greater vigour. But, with the best intentions in the world, and, doubtless, too in prosecution of a system which would have been practically advantageous to the great mass of the industrial classes, we irritated the dangerous classes; without maintaining at the same time a show of strength sufficient to awe them into submission.

We see now that we should either have caged the tiger or should have drawn his teeth and extracted his claws. The Government should either have rendered resistance impossible, by maintaining a large body of European troops in Oude, or have dismantled the forts and disarmed the people. But the troops which had been pushed forward when annexation was first decreed, were withdrawn with a precipitancy warranted by the appearance rather than by the reality of peace. It was believed at Calcutta that Oude was ‘settled,’ and that whatever remained to be done could be done by public proclamation. Accordingly measures were taken to dismantle the fortresses, of the great feudal lords by proclamation. It was declared to be illegal for any subjects of the State to mount guns on their walls or to have ordnance in their keeping. The talookdars were called upon to give up their artillery; and to encourage them the Government declared their willingness to take the metal of the guns at a liberal valuation, in lieu of so much revenue. Many pieces were given up to the government officers; but it is hard to say how many remained still in the keeping of the land-

holders. Since the commencement of the rebellion they have started from the ground.

The general disarming of the people still remained to be effected. Under the superintendence of Sir Henry Lawrence, it had been accomplished, and with marvellous success, in the Punjaub. The 'Punjaub system' was declared to be the model of the new Oude Administration; and they who believed that that system owed much of its success to the general disarming of the people, asked whether any similar precaution was to be taken to secure the success of our administration in Oude. It need not be said that so grave a question did not escape the attention of Indian statesmen. Conflicting opinions were expressed by the different local officers, and the strongest opinion against disarming emanated from a military officer—a man of rare ability—who had himself taken part in the disarming not only of the Punjaub but of Sindh. After a full consideration of the great question in all its bearings, it was decided by the government of Lord Canning that there should be no general disarming of the people of Oude. The carrying of arms in the streets of Lucknow and Fyzabad had been declared illegal; but beyond this nothing was to be done in the way of direct coercion. By increasing the severity of the penal enactments against offences of violence to the person, it was believed that much might be done to diminish the frequency of those numerous sanguinary affrays, for the prevention of which, rather than of any contemplated rising of the people against their new government, a general disarming of the country would have been enacted if at all. The circumstances under which the two countries became British territories, and the social conditions of the people of the Punjaub and of Oude before annexation, were so widely different, that it was held to be impossible to derive any argument in support of the disarming of the one country from the success of that measure in the other.

It was in this condition of affairs—the country swarming with disbanded soldiers—the talookdars feeling the irksomeness of the restraints imposed upon them by a strong and an inquisitive Government with little respect for their might-made rights—our own sepoy and their families deprived of a long-cherished, much-abused privilege—and the people generally in possession of the arms which, under their old native government, had been necessary for that defence which the law did not afford—that Sir Henry Lawrence was despatched to Lucknow to take the place of Mr. Coverley Jackson. He was the man of all others who could have done most good in the province, if he had been sent there at the outset of our

administrative career. He was a man of generous sympathies and of an enlarged toleration, which would not suffer him to scan too nicely or to visit too severely the offences of those who were often the victims rather than the agents of a vicious state of society. And he was especially averse to an over-critical investigation into existing rights, which, though acquired sometimes by fraud, sometimes by oppression, were still only in accordance with the custom of the country, and, indeed, often a necessary consequence of the continued misgovernment of the native rulers. We do not profess to know the precise nature of the settlement operations which were interrupted by the progress of the mutiny in Oude. But we have reason to believe that Sir Henry Lawrence thought that some of the great landholders had been treated with an inexpedient harshness. We can conceive nothing more preposterous than to write or to speak of these men as patriots, fighting for the independence of their country and resenting the indignity of a foreign yoke. But regarding them, as we have already shown, as great robbers and petty tyrants, continually warring against their weaker neighbours, and the sworn foes of the peaceful and industrial classes, we still believe that, both on the score of practical expediency and of abstract justice, it was desirable that at the outset of the British administration in Oude, a more conciliatory policy should have been adopted towards them.

What had been done Sir Henry Lawrence could not undo. He might, had time been allowed to him, have mitigated its evil effects. But he had not been long at Lucknow before the first terrible scenes of the great Bengal mutiny were enacted in Upper India, and Oude itself appeared only too likely to become the arena of a mighty contest. One of the Oude irregular regiments mutinied early in May. There was nothing peculiar in the circumstances of the revolt. The men refused to receive the cartridge, and were guilty of acts of insubordination, necessitating a display of force which awed them into submission. The regiment was broken up, and Sir Henry Lawrence soon afterwards (as we learn from Mr. Rees' interesting narrative) held a Durbar, at which he invested with dresses of honour two of the men who had proved their fidelity to the Government by denouncing the emissaries sent to tamper with the soldiery, and revealing the mutinous designs of their comrades:—

‘He took this opportunity,’ says Mr. Rees, ‘of delivering to the troops a soul-stirring address in excellent Hindostanee, telling them that the British Government, ever anxious to reward loyalty, never missed an occasion of honouring its faithful servants; that some evil-

disposed persons, seeing only a few Europeans here and there, imagined, by circulating false reports, they were able to overthrow the Government; but the power of England, which could send 50,000 men to fight against Russia, could, in the space of three months, land twice that number in India — and much more to the same effect. If anything short of armed resistance could have arrested rebellion, that speech of Sir Henry Lawrence would have had that effect. The city was tranquil for some weeks after; and the Chief Commissioner, well aware of the value of time, made the most of it, in preparing for defence, in the event of insurrection.

On the 30th of May, the native regiments at Lucknow broke out in rebellion. Considering that the troops at all the principal military stations in North-western India had revolted; and that Delhi had then been for some weeks in the hands of the mutineers, there is nothing surprising in this. Events took the common course. The mutiny broke out in cantonments; the mess-houses and bungalows were burnt, and several officers were murdered. In the city the mutineers were attacked by Sir Henry Lawrence, with the Europeans, and Lucknow was saved. There was no rising of the populace; and for some time there was no suspicion of the great danger to come. Lawrence, however, was not a man to wait idly for its coming:—

‘Though the dawks,’ says Mr. Rees, ‘and all communications with other stations had been closed since the 5th of June, few of us expected that we should ever be besieged ourselves and none imagined a siege could have been so protracted. Even Sir Henry himself did not think so; yet, to provide against all contingencies, like a wise and prudent general, he ordered immense supplies of wheat, corn, and all sorts of provisions into the Residency and the Muchee Bawn. This eventually saved our lives. But for his prescience, Lucknow would have been lost, and we should have been starved to death or massacred long before this.’

They were grievously distressed at that time by the thought of the dangers to which their unfortunate countrymen were exposed at Cawnpore; and it may be said that Sir Henry Lawrence should have abandoned his position at Lucknow, and proceeded to Wheeler’s relief, whilst there was still a chance, perhaps a certainty, of saving both forces by such a movement. Upon purely military grounds this opinion may be maintained with a great share of reason in its support. But the question which then pressed for practical solution was not merely a military question. Had it been so, the Defence of Lucknow would probably never have been added to the great events of modern history. But the magnitude of the political considerations involved in the question of the retention or the abandonment of Oude, far exceeded the military importance of

the relief of Cawnpore. No advantages, which could be derived from the extrication of the Lucknow and Cawnpore forces from the perils which surrounded them, or from the services which they might perform at a later period, could be weighed in the scale against the paramount necessity of maintaining our position in Oude. Full authority was given to Lawrence, in case of emergency, to withdraw from the province; but the Governor-General, at the very moment when he gave it, felt in his inmost heart that, unless he had greatly misjudged the man, the accorded permission would never be used. He was right: Lawrence believed that the evacuation of Oude would be the most signal disaster which could befall the British nation in that conjuncture,—that with the rebellious soldiery still in possession of Delhi, the loss of the second great Mahomedan city of Upper India would raise the hopes and stimulate the energies of our enemies all over the country, and that there would be something peculiarly humiliating in our expulsion from a kingdom which had been little more than a year in our hands. The exceptional character of the British position in Oude was such as to demand, at all hazards, its retention. To evacuate Oude was not simply to abandon one part of India and to take up a position in another—a movement, in other parts of the country, attended with little loss of prestige. It was, in point of fact, to allow an integral principality recently gained by force, to be wrested back by its recent possessors. It was not to lose for the time so many square yards of territory; it was to submit to the recovery of a kingdom by the native dynasty which had been supplanted little more than a year before. In the eyes of the natives it would have been a crowning victory; it would have stamped with success the entire revolt. To our national honour it would have been a heavy blow; to our enemies a mighty encouragement. Let the perils and privations in store for himself and for his gallant adherents be what they might, Lawrence resolved that Oude should not cease to be a British province; and throughout the last ten months some portion of the soil of Oude has still been held by a British garrison.

Although his resolution had been taken, it was plain to him that a time of sore trouble was before the Europeans in the Residency. The spirit of insurrection was spreading throughout the capital, and throughout the country. All the predisposing causes to which we have adverted at the commencement of this article, were coming into active operation: the disbanded soldiery, the thwarted zemindars, the sepoy families, irritated

by the loss of their privileges, were all looking on with untitled satisfaction at the perils which were encompassing that little band, and all waiting a fitting opportunity to aggravate them. The Chief Commissioner was prepared for this emergency:—

‘Of the real state of affairs,’ Mr. Rees assures us, ‘Sir Henry Lawrence was well aware. He had already put the Residency under garrison laws, and sentinels and patrols were everywhere posted. He had organised a body of volunteer cavalry, consisting of officers, clerks and others. . . A body of infantry, consisting of civilians, were also drilled and had to perform sentinel and other duties in the various houses and batteries to which they were posted within the Residency compound. Sir Henry Lawrence was indefatigable, and seemed almost never to sleep. Often would he sally out in disguise, and visit the most frequented parts of the native town, to make personal observations and see how his orders were carried out. He several times had a thin bedding spread out near the guns at the Bailey Guard gate, and retired there among the artilleryists, not to sleep but to plan and to meditate undisturbed. He appeared to be ubiquitous and to be seen everywhere. All loved and respected the old gentleman, and indeed everyone had cause, for none was too lowly for his notice and no details were too uninteresting for him. Everyone working under him, no matter how subordinate his position, knew that if he performed his duties cheerfully and well, Sir Henry, who was a keen observer of persons, would not allow him to go unrewarded. The uncovenanted, particularly, had a kind friend in him, and with the common soldier he was equally if not even more popular. On Sir Henry’s removing the head-quarters of his office from cantonments into the Residency he was loudly cheered by the men,—“Long life to Sir Henry! long live Sir Henry!” resounded from all sides; and a long and loud “Hurrah” continued as long as he was visible. One poor man vociferated so loudly that he burst a blood-vessel—a heavy price for a little enthusiasm. Sir Henry seemed to all who saw him to be worn out with fatigue; and his immense responsibility at so critical a period appeared to bear particularly heavy upon him.’

Tempted as we are to linger upon many incidents of this memorable siege, set forth with so much liveliness of description in Mr. Rees’s spirited and unaffected narrative, we must limit our extracts to one or two more passages, and leave the volume itself to tell the rest to all whom it has not already entertained and instructed. The official report of Brigadier Inglis has made the public acquainted with the remarkable circumstances attending the death of Sir Henry Lawrence. We gather, however, some additional information from the following passage in the narrative before us. Both from this passage and from the portrait prefixed to Mr. Rees’ volume the reader may derive an impression that Sir Henry Lawrence was an old man; he had seen much.

service; he had suffered much both of sickness and of sorrow, and he was one who never rested; he had, therefore, a worn, emaciated appearance; but he was not an old man. He was younger than Havelock, Wilson, Outram, and the greater number of officers who have held high command during our recent troubles in Upper India— younger, indeed, than men commonly have been in India when placed in responsible military positions.

‘On the 2nd of July, an event occurred which, a few days later, cast a gloom over the whole garrison. The good and brave Sir Henry Lawrence, while sitting writing in his room, in the second story of the Residency, was struck by a piece of a shell, which had burst between himself, Mr. Couper, his secretary, and Captain Wilson, the Deputy-Assistant-Adjutant-General, whom it slightly wounded. Only a short time before, another shell had fallen into the same apartment, but had injured neither Sir Henry nor any other occupant of the room. In spite of warnings he had made no arrangements to leave the place for a better shelter from the enemy’s fire. The rebels were apparently perfectly acquainted with all the different apartments and their occupants and uses, and directed their fire, accordingly, especially into the Residency and the various powder magazines. Only a very few were made acquainted with the public misfortune which had befallen us. So serious a wound in an old man like Sir Henry I was certain would end fatally. His leg had been amputated, and he died on the evening of the 4th of July, almost to the last fully possessed of his senses, in the midst of the agonies that he suffered. He had nominated Major Banks as his successor. It had not been generally known that our brave old general was dead, for even after he had been buried for some days, the report was circulated that he was getting better. At last, no doubt remained in the minds of any that Sir Henry was indeed no more, and the grief with which this news was received was universal. He had closed a long and noble career, and his death was worthy of his life. He fills the soldier’s grave right worthily. No military honours marked our last acts to his corpse. The times were too stern for idle demonstrations of respect. A hurried prayer amidst the booming of the enemy’s cannon, and the fire of their musketry, was read over his remains, and he was lowered into a pit, with several other, though lowlier, companions in arms. We owe him a heavy debt of gratitude. Peace be to his soul!’

It is not directly stated in this passage, but it is extremely probable, that Lawrence himself on his death had directed those about him not to announce the event as long as it was possible to conceal it. The death of so famous a leader must have occasioned great rejoicing in the rebel camp, and have increased their confidence and presumption. The death of a leader, no matter by what means, is considered by a native army almost

tantamount to a defeat. When Lord Hastings took the field against the Pindarces in 1817, the cholera, then a strange and mysterious visitant, broke out in his camp. Being himself attacked, though not seriously, as it afterwards appeared, by the destroying pestilence, he solemnly enjoined the members of his staff, in the event of his death, to bury him under the table of his tent, and to issue, as long as the deception was practicable, all orders in his name. He had regard in this to the effect that his death at such a time would produce upon the minds both of his own followers and of the people against whom he was moving.

After the death of Sir Henry Lawrence, the chief control of affairs in Lucknow devolved, by special appointment, upon Major Banks, a man of great courage and energy, in whom the garrison appear to have had unbounded confidence. But his career was a short one. His brains were scattered by a round shot within three weeks from the death of his chief. The command was then assumed by Brigadier Inglis, not, we are told, 'without some opposition made by Mr. Gubbins, the Financial Commissioner;' and with the later glories of the memorable defence of Lucknow that gallant name is now imperishably associated. There are few such events in history—none, perhaps, upon which the future chronicler of the great sepoy war will dwell with so much enthusiastic admiration. The high courage of the men—the noble fortitude of the women; all that was done, all that was suffered, in a spirit of the truest heroism, by that beleaguered garrison, amidst dangers and privations of the most appalling and of the most depressing kind, are themes to animate and inspire the dullest chronicler of events. It is our business here to speak rather of those without than of those within the walls, which witnessed so many triumphs of Christian heroism.

The enemy at Lucknow appears from the first to have been of a mongrel character. There were certain revolted regiments, regular and irregular, the sepoys of which in many cases had been joined by their relatives from other parts of the provinces; there were the disbanded soldiers of the old Oude army; and there were the retainers, doubtless, of some of the great talookdars. From the first there appears to have been little union among them. They were continually fighting among themselves, and levying contributions upon the peaceful inhabitants. A glimpse of what was going on outside may be derived from the following extract from Mr. Rees's diary:—

'The sepoys themselves elected their officers, and the officers their commanders, though in the name of the King. But if, as was not



unfrequently the case, they happened to displease the gallant "Jacks," a debating assembly would immediately be held by the privates, at the conclusion of which they would usually signify to their officers, either that they were degraded, or, what suited their cowardly and sanguinary minds better, they attacked and fired on their victims . . . . . As for the citizens, they had no voice in the matter. In Oriental phraseology, "they lived but to obey." Many were, no doubt, well affected towards us, but they dared not show it; and the majority, though they hated us, as Feringhées, could not but long for our rule, plundered, and in continual dread of their lives, as they were. The King's adherents, however, were also very numerous, and the ambitious of all classes, the bravoos and the vagabonds of the city, and the old servants of the former government were all of that class.

We can perceive no indication whatever of a combined national movement. Every class—almost, indeed, it may be said, every man—was aiming at the attainment of some object of which the welfare of others was no part. As time advanced the enemy greatly increased in numbers. Rebel sepoy came in from other parts of the country. The fall of Delhi released thousands, who flocked to Lucknow, or spread themselves over different parts of Oude; some proceeding thither as to a common rallying point; others, again, seeking only their natural homes. If the people were against us in Oude, more than in other parts of the country, it was mainly because there is in the ordinary population a larger infusion of the military element. We have heard, indeed, of whole villages turning out against the English and murdering luckless fugitives. But it has already been shown that there are sepoy villages, as there are robber-villages, in Oude. Colonel Sleeman, in a passage cited at the commencement of this paper, says that our officers have commonly been treated with less courtesy and respect in those villages inhabited by sepoy families than in any others. And we can readily believe that the villagers, whose sons and brothers were actually fighting against us, would not hesitate to cut off stragglers whenever any fell in their way. But such movements are class movements; not national movements. They go no way to shake our rooted belief that what we are now engaged in is strictly a Sepoy War.

An attempt, we know, has been made to invest the movement with something of a national character, by setting up a puppet king. This seems to have been an after-thought, and one attended only with moderate success. The youth who has been placed on this perilous eminence is the son of one of Wajid Ali's wives. His claim to royal descent is at least doubtful. He appears for a time to have had some volunteer subjects; but the priestly authority was at least as strong as the regal, and a Mahom-

medan impostor, boasting of direct revelations from on high, has contrived to get an extensive following of his own. All accounts combine in representing the enemy to be more disunited than ever, and the peaceful inhabitants of the country more oppressed by the tyranny of the military classes. A reign of terror has been established in Lucknow and in the adjacent country, of which the industrious part of the population are longing to see the end. Money and provisions have been extorted by violence from the Mahajuns and others. The necessary exactions of the sepoys for what may be called the support of the war, are followed by those of professional plunderers, who find in the social disorganisation of the capital a golden opportunity not to be neglected. Thousands have lived day after day in a state of perpetual consternation, longing for the restoration of British rule, and the order and tranquillity, the security of life and property, which will speedily follow the re-establishment of our power.

We know that ere this the great series of strategical movements, culminating in the reduction of Lucknow, is brought to a close, and the capital of Oude lies prostrate at the feet of the retributive forces; the consummate skill and enormous power displayed in these operations confer the highest fame on Sir Colin Campbell and Sir William Mansfield, and add another page of glory to the annals of the British army; but the value of this victory is enhanced by the fact that the people, after the first shock of the collision is past, will rejoice to have been rescued from the hands of their military oppressors. A greater work than mere success in war lies before the English conqueror. Oude will more than ever be his. It will be his for the first time by right of conquest. Profiting, then, by experience, he will enter upon the task of reducing the country to order, and laying the foundation of a permanent peace. He must show that he is strong and yet merciful; resolute and yet tolerant. He must dismantle the forts of the great talookdars; he must possess himself of their guns; he must deprive them utterly of the means of violent resistance to constituted authority. But, this done, he must encourage them to look favourably upon the British rule, by conducting the revenue settlements in a liberal spirit, and teaching them that the prosperity which they may enjoy, on such a soil, and under such a government, without continual defiance of the law, and incessant warfare both with the state and with one another, is far more worthy of their possession than the dangerous privilege of transacting business at the cannon's mouth and the tulwar's edge, and the equivocal advantage of defrauding Government of its dues in order that they may expend the revenue, so saved to them, upon the maintenance of large bodies of retainers, who

are a perpetual source of danger and annoyance. Whilst the great landholders are thus deprived of the power of evil and encouraged to the performance of good, the great mass of the people must be dealt with in the same manner. They must be disarmed to a man. At the same time the Indian Government must be careful not to irritate them by the introduction of new fiscal regulations affecting the daily habits of the people and pressing severely upon the very sources of their existence. It must not measure with the English rule, or square with the English plummet. It must be tolerant and compassionate; and not attempt to make model provinces after six months of energetic work. We have now, indeed, no apprehension of a renewed eagerness to see miracles of rapid conversion in newly-acquired provinces. The rulers of India will in future, doubtless, fully appreciate the assistance to be rendered by that invaluable coadjutor, *Time*. With such aid, we believe that Oude may eventually become one of the most prosperous and the most peaceful of the British possessions; and as under its native rulers it has not been, and could never be anything more than a vast den of robbers, we conceive that to restore it to such masters and to condemn it to such a fate would be a great national crime. .

ART. IX.—1. *Earl of Clarendon's Speech in the House of Lords on the recent Communications with the French Government, March 1. 1858.* London: 8vo.

2. *A Bill for the better Government of India.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 18th February, 1858.

3. *A Bill to transfer the Government of India from the East India Company to Her Majesty the Queen.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 26th March, 1858.

ON the 29th of January, 1855, the vote of the House of Commons upon the motion for inquiry into the conduct of the siege of Sebastopol put an end to the Government of Lord Aberdeen, which had already been weakened by the announcement of Lord John Russell's resignation. Of the majority of 305 who voted on this occasion, about two-thirds were Conservatives and one-third Liberals. Her Majesty, accordingly, applied at once to Lord Derby, as the leader of the Conservative party, and authorised him to form an Administration. This task he endeavoured to execute, but failing in his attempt to induce some of the leading members of the preceding Ministry to join him, he abandoned it, from a sense of his inability to

obtain such parliamentary support as would enable him to conduct the affairs of the country with satisfaction and success at so critical an emergency. In explaining to the House of Lords the grounds of his refusal, Lord Derby, with that copiousness and felicity of diction of which none of his predecessors in his high office was perhaps a greater master, dwelt upon the painful and humiliating position of a Minister, who commences his Government, not even with a precarious majority, but with a sure minority; who is therefore unable to carry his own views with energy into effect, but is forced, by petty shifts and expedients, by successive concessions to small knots of men, by clipping and paring down his measures, to appease opponents, and by this submissive policy is alone enabled to flounder on to the end of the session.

Upon Lord Derby's failure to form an Administration, the Queen turned to Lord John Russell for assistance. Lord J. Russell, though he had for several years been ministerial leader of the House of Commons, and had been Prime Minister from 1847 to 1852, was, on account of his recent secession from the Aberdeen Cabinet, and his personal relations with his late colleagues, in a position unfavourable to the difficult task of conducting the negotiations for the construction of a Ministry at a moment of national alarm and disaster, and of that mutual crimination among public men which national alarm and disaster usually bring in their train. He undertook the responsibility of the attempt; but made little progress, and soon desisted from his enterprise. Her Majesty next addressed herself to Lord Palmerston, who had for many years filled the office of Secretary at War, who had subsequently held for a long period the post of Foreign Secretary, and to whom, on account both of his vigour and ability, and his special experience and fitness, the country had looked as well qualified to conduct operations of war. Lord Palmerston succeeded at last in forming a Cabinet, composed to a considerable extent of the members of the preceding Government. Lord John Russell was for a time a member of it, but resigned at the end of the session.

At the accession of Lord Palmerston's Government, the eyes of all England, and indeed of all Europe, were riveted upon the Crimea. Nothing was thought of but the physical privations and precarious position of the British army before Sebastopol. The first object was to supply its wants, to relieve its sufferings, and to reinforce its numbers; the next, to take Sebastopol, and to put an end to the war by a secure and honourable peace. Those objects were accomplished within a time, which, when we compare the duration of former wars between great Powers, and

the magnitude of the contest then raging, is certainly unprecedented, and may fairly be deemed to have surpassed any reasonable expectation. War was declared by Great Britain against Russia on the 28th of March, 1854; the expedition to Sebastopol sailed from Varha on the 4th of September following; the preliminary agreement which virtually put an end to the war was adopted at St. Petersburg in January, 1856; the definitive treaty was signed at Paris in March. The entire duration of the war was therefore only twenty-four months, including one winter during which there had been no fighting, and the interval between March and September, 1854, during which the British forces had not been engaged by land. When it is considered that the three greatest Powers of Europe, —Russia, France, and England, were parties to this war; that two secondary Powers—Turkey and Sardinia, were likewise involved in it; moreover, that Austria was on the point of joining the belligerents, and would have declared war if the terms offered in December, 1855, had been rejected by Russia; it must be admitted that the termination of hostilities and the conclusion of a satisfactory peace within the space of two years, was no ordinary feat of military and diplomatic skill. By the treaty of Paris, the objects for which the war was undertaken were unquestionably accomplished; and although some ulterior arrangements were left by the treaty for subsequent agreement, they have not since given rise to any differences which negotiation has not succeeded in removing, and the settlement effected in 1856 promises to continue on a permanent basis. Treaties of peace are in general unpopular with both belligerents; each party, whether conquering or conquered, commonly believes that if its negotiators had not been overreached, it might have obtained better terms. Although the peace of Paris was not, like the short-lived peace of Amiens, hailed in this country with an explosion of popular joy, it has received the deliberate approbation of the nation, and subsequent events have proved that, though concluded with celerity, its texture is solid and its materials well-cemented.

The Persian campaign of last year may be considered as a sequel of the Crimean war. The occupation of Herat by Persia was, doubtless, instigated for the purpose of threatening our Indian frontier, and the withdrawal of this fortress from the possession of a Power under the immediate influence of Russia has been considered by competent judges as an established maxim of our Asiatic policy. Instead of committing the fatal error which produced such disastrous consequences in the Afghanistan war, —instead of attempting to reach Herat by a land expedition

through the Khyber Pass — a naval expedition was sent from Bombay to the Persian Gulf, which speedily, and with little loss of life, brought the Persian Government to terms. The expedition sailed from Bombay in November, 1856; in March, 1857, a treaty with Persia, stipulating for the evacuation of Herat, was signed with Ferookh Khan, the Persian envoy, at Paris.

The two first sessions of the Palmerston Government were almost exclusively occupied with war, and its consequences: for one of the evils incident to a state of war is that the transition to a state of peace is not made with ease or without much exertion and arrangement. Interests grow up in a time of war which require consideration; and the very adaptations which, in a civilised state, render war tolerable, are obstacles to the speedy re-establishment of the natural order of things. Extraordinary measures become, by habit, our ordinary mode of existence; and it requires an effort to relinquish them. It was therefore impossible that the improvement of our legislation or of our political institutions should receive much attention in the years 1855 and 1856. The old saying, *Silent leges inter arma*, applies not less to the amendment and reform than to the execution of laws. In the winter of 1856, there was, however, reasonable ground for hope that the temple of Janus would be firmly closed; the hostilities with Persia were about to be terminated by a satisfactory treaty; our relations with the European States were pacific; our disputes with the United States about the recruiting question and Central America had either been settled, or had assumed a tone of moderation. Everything seemed to portend a tranquil session, during which the amelioration of our domestic institutions and social reforms would receive an undivided and uninterrupted attention. This apparently well-grounded anticipation was however doomed to be disappointed. Two events, springing out of our extensive empire and the wide ramifications of our commercial and colonial interests, came at this time to disturb the prospect of external tranquillity.

The first of these was the affair of the 'Arrow,' and the consequent hostilities at Canton at the end of 1856, the intelligence of which reached England about the beginning of the session of 1857. It is far from our intention to re-argue, or even to re-state, the case of the *lorcha*, and its colonial registry, and the demands of Sir J. Bowring upon Commissioner Yeh. This subject received ample elucidation, in Parliament and out of Parliament, at the time. The result was, that a few words in a despatch of the Foreign Secretary, conveying his approbation of Sir John Bowring's conduct, incurred, upon the motion of

Mr. Cobden, the censure of the House of Commons, which condemned the policy of the Government as unduly aggressive and warlike, by a majority of 263 to 247. The resolution affirmed that the papers laid upon the table of the House 'failed to establish satisfactory grounds for the violent measures resorted to at Canton in the late affair of the "Arrow:"' (March 3.) From this decision Lord Palmerston appealed to the country; and the result of a general election showed that the view of the House of Commons with respect to the support of British functionaries on distant stations, where their instructions were necessarily vague, and a wide discretion was confided to them, was not shared by the people at large. The doctrines of the Peace Party in Parliament, as applied to the Canton dispute, met with no response out of doors, and the new Parliament did not exhibit any disposition to re-affirm or follow up the vote of censure carried by its predecessor.

The dissolution of Parliament, produced by this vote, interrupted and retarded the progress of business; but after Easter the Government succeeded in carrying an important bill for the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Courts,—a question which had defied the efforts of successive Governments for a long course of years. This was followed by a measure for altering the procedure and some of the conditions of the law in cases of Divorce; which, though it had not the importance that the rhetorical inflation of parliamentary debate sought to affix upon it, was nevertheless in reality a measure of considerable utility, inasmuch as it placed this branch of our law and practice upon a consistent and intelligible footing.

But another event had by this time occurred, which, even more than the affair of the Chinese lorcha, arrested the attention of Parliament and of the public, and diverted it from the even course of domestic improvement. After some scattered outbreaks in regiments of the native army of Bengal, a native cavalry regiment stationed at Meerut broke into open mutiny, was joined by the other native regiments at the same station, and marched to Delhi. An alarm at that time pervaded the Bengal army that the Government intended to take away their caste and religion; but up to the present moment no proof of conspiracy or concert in the Bengal army, either among Hindoos or Mahometans, has been produced; and the most competent and best informed judges in India are of opinion that the cartridges were the immediate occasion of the revolt.

It would be superfluous in us to pursue this subject in detail, or to trace the steps by which this outbreak spread to the rest of the Bengal native army; but, although large dis-

tricts were for a time withdrawn from the strong hand of British authority, and anarchy and rapine prevailed, nevertheless the revolt maintained consistently its military character, and it never involved, to any extent, the native chiefs or native population. We have already devoted an article to this subject, in which our opinions were fully expressed\*, and we merely repeat these facts now for the purpose of contrasting them with the views taken by Mr. Disraeli, in an elaborate speech on the subject, which he delivered in the House of Commons at the end of last session (July 27. 1857). This speech was ushered in with great parade; it was manifestly the result of much thought and careful preparation; it has the merit, rare among Mr. Disraeli's effusions, of being clear, straightforward, and unequivocal; it is so copious that it occupies forty columns in Hansard's Debates; and he declares in it that he seeks no fleeting party triumph, but wishes to guide the House 'to a safe conclusion after deep consideration.' We may therefore take it as a favourable specimen of his deliberate opinions upon a great question of policy; and as a test by which his capacity for advising the Crown and the Parliament on important public measures may be fairly tried.

Near the outset of his speech, Mr. Disraeli condemns as utterly untenable the opinion that the revolt of the Bengal army was a sudden impulse, occasioned by superstitious feelings, or a mere military mutiny. Further on, he ridicules the explanation derived from the change of cartridges; and says that 'the decline and fall of empires are not affairs of greased cartridges.' He then asks, 'Is it a military mutiny, or is it a national revolt? Is the conduct of the troops the consequence of a sudden impulse, or is it the result of an organised conspiracy?' These questions he proceeds to answer by showing at length that through the systematic misgovernment of India, for some years past, the princes and people had become disaffected to the British rule; that a widespread combination against our dominion had been formed, and that the mutiny of the troops was the first manifestation and expression of this general feeling. 'The conduct of the Bengal army (he says) in revolting against our authority was the conduct of men who were not so much the avengers of professional grievances as the exponents of general discontent;' and he describes the army not as originating the rebellion, but as being 'at last drawn into the vortex.' He next proceeds to explain the causes out of which this general alienation of the princes and people from the Go-



vernment had sprung. He lays it down that the good old system of Indian government was abolished in the year 1848, and that a new and vicious system dates from that era.\* The new system consists: 1. In the forcible destruction of native authority, chiefly by the annexation of territory. 2. In a disturbance of the settlement of property, principally by inquiries into titles to exemption from land-tax. 3. In tampering with the religion of the people. He exhibits these elements of disaffection as pervading the whole mass of Indian society, and disintegrating the cohesion of British authority; and then adverts to the annexation of Oude as aggravating the alarm and bringing matters to a crisis. These views are summed up in the following passage:—

‘You see how the plot thickens. You have the whole of the Indian princes—men of different races and different religions—men between whom there were traditional feuds and long and enduring prejudices, with all the elements to produce segregation—become united—Hindoos, Mahrattas, Mahomedans—secretly finding a common interest and a common cause. Not only the princes but the proprietors are against you. Estates as well as musnuds are in danger. You have an active society spread over all India, alarming the ryot, the peasant, respecting his religious faith.’

Having thus carefully built up the conclusion that the late outbreak in India had no connexion with purely military feelings; that a grand conspiracy against our rule pervaded the country; that the native army were not the first to join in it; and that this conspiracy was produced by breaches of faith with princes and proprietors, and a consequent sense of the insecurity of all titles, as well as by a systematic interference with the religions of the country; he shows what are the practical inferences to be drawn from this conclusion, and describes the remedies which these deep-seated evils demand.

‘A mere military mutiny may be met by a mere military effort. But if, on the contrary, what we have to deal with be an insurrection, supported by the favour and sympathy of the great mass of the population, our measures must, as I think, be both in nature and degree different from those of which we have had an intimation from H. M. Government. *Looking upon this as a national revolt*, I cannot adopt ‘the belief that the measures announced by the Government—*merely military measures*, are adequate to the occasion.’

Having thus, to his satisfaction, established the necessity of

---

\* Lord Dalhousie was appointed Governor-General on August 4th, 1847, under the Government of Lord John Russell, and commenced his administration with the following year; which is the reason why it is selected as an epoch by Mr. Disraeli.

treating the malady as one springing out of civil maladministration, not out of military discontent, he propounds his remedy in the following authoritative manner:—

‘You ought to have a Royal Commission sent by the Queen from this country to India immediately, to inquire into the grievances of the various classes of that population. You ought to issue a Royal Proclamation to the people of India, declaring that the Queen of England is not a sovereign who will countenance the violation of treaties — that the Queen of England is not a sovereign who will disturb the settlement of property — that the Queen of England is a sovereign who will respect their laws, their usages, their customs, and above all, their religion. Do all this, and do this not in a corner, but in a mode and manner which will attract universal attention, and excite the general hope of Hindostan, and you will do as much as your fleets and armies can achieve.’

The true nature of the Indian rebellion having thus been disclosed, and the true remedy for the ills of India having been announced, Mr. Disraeli winds up his oration with the following magniloquent menace:—

‘I wish to show to Europe and to Asia that it is not the object of the British Parliament to overthrow a Ministry, but to save an empire. . . . We shall meet again, and perhaps sooner than this House two months ago deemed probable; and if they (the Government) neglect their duty to the country, I, for one, will not shrink from responsibility. I will then appeal with confidence to an indignant people and to a determined Parliament, and will ask them to unite their energies to save an endangered empire.’

Now it is scarcely possible for any view to be more thoroughly erroneous than that taken in the above speech. The opinion laid down by Mr. Disraeli with so much confidence is not only wrong, but it is the very reverse of right. He denies the Indian mutiny to be what it is; he affirms it to be what it is not. It would be an error to maintain that the French Revolution of 1789 was caused by the intrigues of England. But it would be a still greater error to maintain that it was produced by the excess of democratic privileges under the ancient monarchy, and by the insufficient powers of the King, the Church, and the Aristocracy. In like manner it would be a serious error to assert that the Indian rebellion was not a military mutiny; but it is a still more serious error to maintain that it was a general insurrection of the population, caused by the abuses of the civil power. The characteristic feature of this singular movement has been that it not only began as a military mutiny, but that it retained that character throughout its progress; and that it has continued, and apparently will end,

as it began. Now it is quite conceivable that a military mutiny, springing up accidentally, might lead to a general insurrection of the nation. Such was the case with the most important military revolt of which history makes mention; that which is called the Carthaginian war of the mercenaries, at the end of the First Punic War. By this war Carthage was brought to the brink of ruin; as the population in the subject cities sympathised with the mutineers, and readily joined their standard; the women even contributed their gold ornaments in support of the cause. Again, to descend to our own times, if the Austrian regiments in Lombardy, or the Neapolitan regiments in Sicily, were from some special ground of professional discontent to break into a mutiny, it probably would not be long before the populations of Lombardy and Sicily would rise. We will come nearer home, and express our belief that if at the heat of the Repeal agitation in Ireland, all the troops in that country had mutinied against the Government, the bulk of the people would have speedily imitated their example. Even if events had followed this course in India — if the people in the North had taken advantage of the defection of the native army to throw off the British yoke — Mr. Disraeli's view would have been incorrect. But what is remarkable in this rebellion — what peculiarly distinguishes it from every other rebellion recorded in history — is that under the temptation afforded by the mutiny of a whole army, the population remained passive, and showed no disposition to join the insurgents against their foreign masters. On the other hand, the native princes, from prudential and interested motives, taking a correct view of the probable result, afforded active assistance to our Government. Neutrality of the people, with active support of the princes, has been the characteristic of the late movement. It may seem strange that any man of Mr. Disraeli's undoubted abilities should have so completely misconstrued passing events fully reported by witnesses on the spot. We attribute this elaborate perverseness of judgment to a determination to be wiser than his neighbours — to assume that what is obvious cannot be true — to look below the surface for what is on the surface, to refuse to think with the crowd when the crowd are right, and to usurp the office of teacher when his learners were as well informed as himself. In this instance, these illusions were probably fostered by a belief that he had a peculiar vocation for finding the key of an Asiatic mystery.

The remedy which he proposes for his imaginary disease is more absurd than the error of his view of the facts is fundamental. If the policy pursued in India since 1848 is unsound, it ought undoubtedly to be changed, and changed without loss of

time. It is indeed a policy in which the Board of Control, the Court of Directors, and the Governor-General are all equally involved. It is a policy of which Parliament must have full knowledge, as it was in full operation when the Committees of the Lords and Commons sat in 1852 and 1853. But if it is to be altered, the proper course is to change the executive officers, or at all events to give them fresh instructions. But to leave everything as it is, but to condemn the acts of all previous governments, and virtually to supersede the authority of the Governor-General, by a royal commission sent from this country, which is 'to attract universal attention, and excite the general hope of 'Hindustan,' seems to us one of the wildest and weakest schemes which ever entered the brain of a sane man.

In some subsequent addresses to rural audiences, Mr. Disraeli followed up the same strain of remark, insisting on the contagious and popular nature of the revolt, and indulging freely his vein (to use Lord Wellesley's phrase) of 'sanguine despondency,' reckoning up every item of disaster and danger, with the patriotic desire of converting them into missiles against the Government.

Since these speeches of Mr. Disraeli, and the gloomy vaticinations to which his thoroughly false estimate of passing events conducted him, Delhi has, by the remarkable judgment and skill of the commanding officer, and the bravery of the attacking force, been taken, and the head of the rebellion has been thus crushed. Subsequently Lucknow, after a heroic defence, has been twice relieved, and eventually captured. After so widespread a revolt, anarchy naturally prevails in certain districts; but all open and avowed resistance to the authority of the British Government may now be considered to be at an end, except in Oude and Rohilcund. The fugitives who have escaped from the fall of Lucknow and the pursuit of the British cavalry, have fled to Rohilcund; and Oude, a country never completely reduced under British sway, is in a state of insurrection; but with these exceptions, the formidable Indian mutiny, the subject of so much well-founded and so much ill-founded alarm, was practically suppressed before Lord Palmerston left office, within nine months after its outbreak.

Before we quit this subject, we cannot forbear from expressing our reprobation of the narrow-minded and short-sighted jealousy which induced the Conservative leaders in the House of Commons to protest against the inclusion of Lord Canning in the vote of thanks moved by Lord Palmerston for the military successes in India. We are far from undervaluing the military achievements of our fellow-countrymen in the late struggle. Generals Wilson, Outram, and Havelock, by their several per-

formances, prepared the way for the masterly strategy of Sir Colin Campbell; the defence of Lucknow by Inglis, is an event unsurpassed in heroism and endurance, and will long live in history. Though surprised by the mutiny of a whole army, over a vast extent of country, our countrymen, surrounded, betrayed, cut off from assistance, few in number, and with no speedy prospect of reinforcement, never flinched. They held their ground manfully; some were overwhelmed where they stood; but the majority weathered the storm, and maintained themselves until succour could be provided by the Government. This succour first came from the resources of the Punjaub, organised by the able hand of Sir J. Lawrence, to which some regiments diverted from their road to China proved a welcome adjunct; but it is remarkable that Delhi was taken before any troops arrived from England. The late conflicts in India have shown that it is the courage and moral qualities, not the skill of the Englishman, in which his superiority over the native soldier chiefly consists. The time is past when an Indian army was a mere armed rabble; battles are not now like Plassey, at which Lord Clive lost twenty-two men killed, and the enemy 500. In the recent conflict we have had to contend against troops to which we had communicated our own skill and discipline; but with all these advantages, the native soldiers will rarely face the British regiments in open fight. For their resolute and unbending hardihood, for their soldierlike daring and endurance, for their determination never to despair of success, our countrymen in India deserve the highest meed of praise; and it has been given them ungrudgingly by the general voice of England. But while we willingly recognise these high qualities, we must not overlook the fact that it is not merely by battles in the field that the Indian mutiny has been suppressed. Nothing has been more remarkable than the fact, that, throughout its whole progress, it has faithfully retained the character of a military revolt. It has involved the whole native Bengal army; it has spread to the northern contingents; it has reached some Bombay regiments; it has touched the Nizam's army; it has threatened the Madras army; but except in the newly annexed State of Oude, it has not been taken up by the population. Now it is this circumstance which has saved India to England. If, as at the Sicilian Vespers, the whole population of India, with its tens of millions, had at the first signal of resistance risen against the English, our rule in India might perhaps by great exertions and large expenditure have been recovered; but we should only have recovered a population waiting the next favourable opportunity for revolt, and have reestablished an empire founded on sand. It

was the general good will of the population which rendered the suppression of the military mutiny both practicable and beneficial. This good will was owing to the civil, not to the military, government of the country. It could only be retained by the same general spirit of equity and moderation by which the civil government had been characterised. If Lord Canning, instead of being guided by sound maxims of far-sighted justice and clemency, had been influenced by the sanguinary passions of the English of Calcutta, and had issued orders of indiscriminate vengeance and proscription of the natives, military successes might indeed have been achieved against individual bodies of men, but they would have been worthless amidst the defection of the entire population.

Under the favourable progress of military operations in India, and the absence of all urgent pressure on the Company's finances, Parliament would have met at the usual time, if a commercial crisis had not unexpectedly arisen in October and November, which compelled the Government to authorise the Bank of England to exceed the limits of issue fixed by the Act of 1844, and therefore to assemble Parliament without delay for the consideration of a Bill of Indemnity. This crisis did not arise out of any defect in our currency laws; it was not aggravated by any imprudence or mismanagement of the Bank Directors; but it was caused by a commercial convulsion in America, operating upon extensive abuses of credit in this country, before the firms involved could adopt precautionary measures. The indemnity sought for was granted unanimously, and without hesitation, by both Houses; it was admitted that the extraordinary interference of the Government was fully justified both by precedent and by the exigencies of the case, and Parliament showed no disposition to prolong its sitting beyond the week required for the settlement of the currency business. Since that time the money market has recovered itself with wonderful rapidity, showing that the derangement, though great at the moment, was not deepseated; the Bank rate of interest, which was ten per cent. at Christmas, had by February fallen to three per cent.; the Bank cellars are overflowing with bullion, and a state of plethora has succeeded to a state of exhaustion.

It should not be overlooked that, although the Conservative Opposition abstained from any attempt to censure the relaxation of the Act of 1844, they nevertheless resisted the proposal of the Government for the reappointment of the Bank Acts Committee, on the ground that all inquiry was superfluous, and that the subject was ripe for immediate legislation. This immediate legislation was (so far as could be collected from the elaborate

speech of their leader) to consist in a complete reversal of Sir R. Peel's bank policy, and a repeal of the Act of 1844.

'It is impossible in my mind (said Mr. Disraeli in the House of Commons, on the 11th of December last) to resist the conviction that the Act of 1844, which after all is an Act only regulating the circulation and the issue of bank-notes, is an Act drawn up in deference to those fallacious principles respecting issues which have so long and so fatally prevailed in this country, that all the arrangements of that Act are framed in deference to those mistaken views, and that in consequence of that deference they have exercised an aggravating influence upon commercial distress when it has arisen.'

The Queen's speech, delivered in December, had directed the attention of Parliament to the government of India and to the state of the representation; and it was understood that Lord Palmerston's Government were prepared to introduce in the course of the session, first an India Bill, and then a Reform Bill. The former of these measures was brought forward a short time after the re-assembling of Parliament, and the plan of the Government, which involved the abolition of the Court of Directors, and the creation of a council in immediate contact with the Indian Minister, was opened by Lord Palmerston. His motion was met by a dilatory amendment of Mr. T. Baring, affirming the inexpediency of legislating at present for the government of India. The mover of the amendment dwelt principally, though not exclusively, on the argument of time; but as the debate proceeded, the ground of time was dropped, and the proposition was resisted on the principle of the Bill. The difficulty was felt of defending the maintenance of a form of government at a moment of peculiar pressure, unless it could be denied that the form was complex, weak, and radically defective. It became therefore necessary for the impugners of the Ministerial Bill to defend the form of the Home Indian Government, and this was the shape which the debate speedily assumed. The modest petition of the Company, in which they accused themselves of every human and almost every angelic virtue, was lauded to the skies; and it was boldly maintained that the Company's government was better than any conceivable direct organisation under the Crown and Parliament. This was the purport of the harangues of Mr. Whiteaide, now Attorney-General for Ireland, and of Sir E. Lytton, the latter of whom, concerning the argument of time, denounced the Government Bill as 'audacious, incomplete, and unconsidered.' Lord John Russell, who spoke on the last night in favour of the Bill, justly remarked:—

'We have for three nights been debating the question, with but

very few speakers who support the argument for delay ; indeed, the supporters of the honourable gentleman (Mr Baring) ; on the contrary, have urged every argument to show that the present form of government should not be disturbed, that the India Company should be kept in the same form in which it at present exists, and that there would be the greatest danger in making any change.'

Lest any doubt should remain as to the grounds on which the Bill of the Government was opposed, Mr. Disraeli wound up the debate by a speech attacking the very principle of the Bill. He laid it down broadly that what was defective in the Indian Government was to be looked for in India, and not at home ; that a reform of the Home Government was not needed ; that the Government plan necessarily involved the amalgamation of the Imperial and Indian exchequers, and the direct responsibility of the British taxpayer for deficits of Indian expenditure, and the assumption by England of a perilous and unlimited liability ; he recommended the House not to agree to the Bill, until they had seen the Chancellor of the Exchequer's budget for the year. He declared that what was wanted was a reform of the administration of India, and particularly of the system of land-revenue ; and he reverted to his dangerous plan of a Royal Commission, propounded in August last, as the true panacea for the ills of India. The following extracts will show the general character of the views on Indian government announced by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer to the House of Commons so late as the 18th of February last.

' India is not governed in Cannon Row or in Leadenhall Street ; it is governed in Calcutta. If you pass an Act of this kind, which, by a phrase seems to change the Government of India, you will, without acting upon the more distant and real Government, entail upon this country all the consequences of the policy and the engagements of the Government of India, while in fact you will have no control whatever over the system which prevails in that country. *You will find that when you have passed this Bill, you will have less means of governing India than, by the somewhat roundabout system which exists, you even now obtain.* What is the real Government of India ? If you form your opinion from the Bill which the noble Lord has described, you would imagine that the Government of India depended upon a few individuals living in England, receiving public salaries, and obeying the dictates and commands of a Minister of State ; but the Government of India is something very different. The Government of India has, in the first place, to deal with the raising of an immense revenue, which is not adequate to the expenditure, and unless, *when you take upon yourselves the pecuniary responsibilities of India*, you at the same time take measures by which you can appropriate and prudently manage the resources of that country, all that you will obtain by the Bill which the Government



now asks permission to introduce, all that you will obtain will be, that you will have to supply the deficiencies of a distant Government, over which you will have no control, and the course of which, as I shall show you, will inevitably aggravate all those injurious consequences, which you imagine by this Act you are going to terminate. *What you want is a total change of the system of administration in India.* You want to put an end to the expenditure which produces deficits. You want a power that will examine your relations with native princes; you want a power that will examine the means by which your revenue is raised, which will examine into the tenure of land, and which will bring native capital, which is abundant, to the cultivation of that land. . . . 'Those things, managed with great talent and discretion, by a particular service organised for that object, and whose existence depended upon the raising of the revenue, have, with great occasional disadvantages and deficiencies, worked pretty well; but it will be quite different when the credit of England and the credit of India are perfectly identical. If once the deficiency in India is to be supplied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons, no one will have any great interest in the prudent management of the resources of that country. I say again, you are beginning at the wrong end. You ought to have adopted the course which I took the liberty of recommending last year. When you had put down the rebellion, you ought to have sent to India a Royal Commission, with plenary powers. It would have been for that Commission to investigate the great questions to which I have referred; it would have been for that Commission to revise and establish your relations with native princes, and to organise and construct your forces, which never can be formed out of the crude material to which the noble lord has referred. . . . That Commission ought to have inquired whether the tenure of land, upon which all depends, might not be modified beneficially for all parties; and then, when you had made yourselves, when the country had made itself, master of the situation, *then it would have been high time to consider whether formally and completely, in the metropolis, the change should not have been carried out, which would transfer the supreme authority in India to Her Majesty.* At present we are undertaking an immense liability; we are entering into engagements which will some day make us tremble; and we have no security whatever that those who really possess power in India, who really manage the resources of that country, will be in the least controlled for our benefit, or will so manage those resources, or exercise that authority, that the proposed arrangement shall not produce increased evils.'

We invite the particular attention of our readers to the preceding extracts from Mr. Disraeli's speech, because it presents a view of Indian policy quite peculiar to himself and diametrically opposite to that pursued by the late Government. It discounts all present reform of the home Government; it assumes that the direct government of India in the Queen's name necessarily involves the fusion of the Imperial and Indian exchequers,

and renders England liable for all the debts and deficiencies of India, in a manner in which it is not liable at present. It teaches us to begin our reforms with the local Government; to make a total change in the system of administration in India, and in particular to revise our relations with the native princes, to alter the tenures of land, and to remodel the land revenue system. In order to introduce these changes, a Royal Commission, with plenary executive powers, is to be issued; and when this commission has completed the reorganisation of the external relations, the land tenures, and the taxation of India, then, but not till then, the question of the Queen's supremacy and of the abolition of the Company may properly be taken into consideration.

It was, however, in vain that these alarming results of the measure of the late Government were exhibited to the House by Mr. Disraeli, or that he again recommended to them his specific of a Royal Commission. Upon a division 318 to 173 votes were given against the amendment, and in favour of the introduction of the Bill, being a majority of 145. After so long a debate, in which every argument in favour of the double Government had been exhausted by the advocates of the present system, this division was considered as conclusive, and it sounded the knell of the Company.

*‘Hæc finis Priami fatorum, hic exitus illum  
Sorte tulit, Trojam incensam et prolapsa videntem  
Pergama; tot quondam populis terrisque superbum  
Regnatorem Asiæ.’*

The decision of the House on this point has been since accepted as final by Lord Derby's Government. We shall inquire presently how far the India Bill of that Government is consistent with Mr. Disraeli's former speeches.

We now pass to another subject, which brings us to the close of Lord Palmerston's Administration. A short time before the reassembling of Parliament, a sanguinary attempt had been made on the person of the Emperor Louis Napoleon, by Italians, who had for a time found a refuge in this country; and who had, during their residence in England, organised their plot and prepared the instruments for its execution. The mode of execution chosen by the conspirators displayed a remarkable disregard of human life; inasmuch as the number of killed and wounded actually exceeded 150, although some of the grenades did not explode. Moreover, if the attempt to kill the Emperor had succeeded, the Empress, who was seated by his side in the carriage, could scarcely have escaped. It was natural that this

attempt upon the Emperor's life should excite, not only among the persons attached to his dynasty and government but among the public at large, a strong feeling of indignation against those political exiles who were believed to have contrived the plot in their safe asylum on this side of the Channel, and to have hired assassins to risk their lives in the performance of a deed which they had not the courage to attempt for themselves. This feeling, strongest when the impressions of the act were fresh, was communicated by the French authorities to Lord Cowley at Paris, and by the French ambassador to the English Government in London. The measure which the French Government would doubtless have preferred, was an Alien Act, enabling the Executive Government to send away foreigners on suspicion, similar to the Act which was passed during the French Revolution, which continued in force till 1827, and was re-enacted for a year in 1848. The Government, however, were not prepared to propose to Parliament any measure of this kind; and when M. de Persigny gave to Lord Clarendon, on the 21st of February, the despatch of Count Walewski, upon which so much has turned, he received an oral answer, which we subjoin in Lord Clarendon's words:—

*'I repeated to M. de Persigny, what I had often said to him before, and had explained personally, at various times, to Count Walewski, and also had had the honour of stating to the Emperor himself, viz., that no consideration on earth would induce Parliament to pass a measure for the extradition of political refugees, that the right of asylum could not be infringed, and that there were fundamental principles of law so ancient and so sacred in this country that they could not be touched; but that we required no impulse from without to set in motion the law as it stood, which was applicable to conspiracy, provided we had evidence to go upon, and that it had been for the want of sufficient evidence that the law as it stood had not been brought to bear upon such offences. I said it was a question whether the law was as complete and as stringent as it might be, but that the whole subject had been referred to the law officers of the Crown, under whose consideration it then was; and I, moreover, told M. Persigny, that I had myself, the day before, written to the Attorney-General, inviting his attention to certain points, and requesting an early opinion from the law officers.'*

Such was the interlocutory answer which, at this stage of the proceedings, the Secretary of State gave to the French ambassador. It should likewise be noted that, as appears from Lord Clarendon's words, the subject was not a new one between him and the French Government. The existence of a body of political refugees in this country, suspected of entertaining designs hostile to the person of the Emperor, had doubtless long attracted the

notice of the French Government, and had, on previous occasions, been made the subject of discussion and remonstrance with our Government. The excesses to which the French refugees had gone in Jersey, with respect to publications against the Emperor, had even led, in a previous year, to their expulsion from that island, under the power which the Governor legally possesses. The subject was not new between Lord Clarendon and M. de Persigny, and therefore there was the less demand for a formal authoritative written declaration of the views of the British Government as to the expulsion of political refugees.

Lord Clarendon did not confine his answer to the explanations afforded to M. de Persigny. He also conveyed to Lord Cowley his views in letters, of which the contents were to be stated to the French Government. The following are extracts from his letters of the 23rd of January and the 2nd of February, and from them the general spirit of the other letters written at the same time may, we presume, be fairly collected:—

‘The refugee question has been discussed in every possible form, and I may with truth say that there has been an earnest desire to do something which will both clear this country from unjust imputations and, at the same time, give some satisfaction to public opinion in France; but the difficulties, when one comes to the practical point of what that *something* shall be, are beyond imagination great, and everybody agrees that to ask for authority to send away any or every foreigner whom a foreign Government suspect, or say they suspect, without even adducing any proof of guilty purpose, is utterly out of the question. We might just as well ask Parliament to annex England to France.’

‘A Bill is to be introduced when Parliament meets which will make conspiracy to murder felony, and you may rely upon it that if the Bill passes, it will be amply sufficient for the purpose, and immeasurably better than if we possessed a power to send away people on suspicion; for what is to constitute suspicion or to make a man suspected? — a denunciation from the French police? If so, it is clear that we should be perpetually asked to send away people on mere rumour, or perhaps the personal vengeance of spies, and that the only result would be ill-feeling between the two Governments. Parliament, however, would never grant such a permission, because, setting aside all other reasons, it would be inverting the fundamental principles of jurisprudence in this country, where a man is always considered innocent until he is proved to be guilty, and we should have to propose that he be considered guilty until he could prove himself to be innocent.’

Now, we are not left to conjecture respecting the use which was made of these communications. Lord Cowley, in his de-

spatch to Lord Clarendon of February 20th, says, in reference to Count Walewski's despatch:—

Although I have not been charged to make any official communication to the French Government in answer to that despatch, I have been enabled by Your Lordship's private instructions to place before the French Government the sentiments, views, and intentions of Her Majesty's Government far more fully, and I cannot but believe more satisfactorily, than would have been the case had my language been clothed in a more official garb.

Lord Cowley proceeds to show that the abstinence from written argumentation tended to diminish irritation, at a moment when irritation necessarily existed; and he states that he had, on the authority of letters from Lord Clarendon, informed the French Government that the English Cabinet would not propose to Parliament any measure for abridging the right of asylum enjoyed by political refugees. He expressly appeals to the Emperor and Count Walewski, as knowing the truth of his statement.

The time and manner of Lord Cowley's despatch have been criticised, but no one has doubted his honour and veracity; and we may take it as an established fact that the refusal of the late Cabinet to sanction the expulsion of political refugees on grounds of suspicion was conveyed, in the most unambiguous manner, to the French Government, both in Paris and London; and that no doubt was left in their minds on the subject.

Shortly after the reopening of the session, Lord Palmerston moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the crime of conspiring to murder; which, though a capital offence in Ireland, was in England only a misdemeanor. The object of this Bill was declared to be, the more effectual prevention of such attempts as that recently made against the French Emperor. Upon this motion an amendment was moved by Mr. Kinglake, postponing legislation until further information was laid before Parliament of the communications between the two Governments since the date of Count Walewski's despatch. The introduction of the Bill was resisted by Lord J. Russell, and other members of the Liberal party; but it was supported by the Conservatives; the amendment was withdrawn, and the motion for the introduction of the Bill was, on February 9th, carried by 299 to 99 votes.

It should not be overlooked that, subsequently to the decision of the Government to propose legislation respecting conspiracies to murder, some addresses of French regiments to the Emperor, couched in language of menace, highly offensive and insulting to this country, had been inserted in the 'Moniteur.' These

addresses had been commented on, in language not less measured, in the House of Commons, and had excited the natural resentment and indignation of the country. The effect produced by these addresses having been represented to the Emperor, he authorised a despatch to be written to Count Persigny, in which he stated that the addresses had been inserted in the 'Moniteur' through inadvertence, and expressed his regret at the occurrence. This despatch (dated February 6.), was read to the House of Commons by Sir G. Grey, and appears to have been received as an adequate atonement for the offence. The large majority by which the House agreed to the motion of the Government, subsequently to the reading of the despatch, is a proof that it had condoned this affront. It is true that this atonement would have been more complete, if the despatch, like the addresses which gave rise to it, had been inserted in the 'Moniteur.'

Such was the posture of affairs, when Mr. Milner Gibson moved an amendment upon the second reading of the Conspiracy Bill, in which the House expresses its detestation of the recent attempts on the Emperor's life, alleged to have been devised in England, and its readiness to assist in remedying proved defects in the Criminal Law, and proceeds thus:—

'Yet it cannot but regret that Her Majesty's Government, previously to inviting this House to amend the law of conspiracy by the second reading of this Bill, at the present time, *has not felt it to be their duty to make some reply to the important despatch received from the French Government, dated Paris, Jan. 20. 1858, which has been laid before Parliament.*'

This amendment simply repeated, in a more hostile form, the resolution which Mr. Kinglake had been requested to withdraw. It was, however, supported not only by the members of the Liberal party who were hostile to the Bill, but also by the Conservatives, who declared that, through the neglect of the Government to answer Count Walewski's despatch, the honour of the country had been inadequately maintained. The result was, that the amendment was affirmed by 234 to 215 votes; and Lord Palmerston's Government, regarding the vote as a censure of their conduct, with respect to the maintenance of the national honour in a correspondence with a foreign Government, resigned on the following day. Her Majesty then applied to the leader of the most numerous party, by whose adverse vote the Government had been deliberately censured, and compelled to resign. The result was, the formation of Lord Derby's present Administration.

We will now attempt to take a dispassionate review of these events, and to ascertain the true character of a transaction

which is alleged to have involved a violation of the national honour, and which led to the overthrow of a Ministry, supported up to that time by large majorities.

In the first place, we lay it down as an indisputable principle that, looking to all the circumstances of the late attempt on the Emperor's life, his Government were fully justified in representing to our Government their wish that a more complete protection should be given by our laws against the repetition of such attempts. It may turn out, upon careful investigation, that our law gives to foreign sovereigns, and to other foreigners, all the protection in this respect which can be reasonably claimed, and which can be practically afforded. This is conceivable: nevertheless, the circumstances of the late attempt, the conversion of England into a convenient receptacle and starting-place for conspirators, created a *prima facie* case against the sufficiency of our laws, and justified temperate remonstrance, particularly at a moment of alarm, suspicion, and excited feeling. It has been said repeatedly — and perhaps this has been the prevalent feeling of the country — that, even if our law is defective, and requires amendment, we ought not to legislate 'under dictation.' Now, if by dictation is meant menace, we deny that there has been any menace, except the vapouring of the colonels, to the true character of which we shall advert presently; but at all events, it was not the language of the Government; and so far as it received any countenance by its publication in the 'Moniteur,' this was cancelled by the subsequent disavowal and expression of regret on the part of the Emperor. But if by dictation is meant representation, request, application, to our Government for an alteration of our law, we say that this is a step which one country is fully entitled to take with respect to another.

Such a proceeding is founded on a general right, the mutual exercise of which between independent States is of constant occurrence. The most familiar examples of its exercise are those which concern questions of trade and navigation. Negotiations for treaties of commerce, and the various questions involved in commerce (such as fisheries, slave trade, neutral rights, &c.), are perpetually passing between Governments. Yet every one of these negotiations involves a demand by one country for the alteration of the laws of another country. Negotiations for treaties of extradition and of international copyright imply a similar postulate. It may be laid down as a general principle that, if the municipal laws of any country in their consequences injuriously affect any other country, the Government of the latter country may make to the Government of the former country a representation on the subject, and a demand for a legis-

lative change, provided that this representation and this demand are couched in temperate and proper language.. The civilised nations of Europe form one family, the different members of which are every year drawn more closely together by a community of interests, and by the increased rapidity, facility, and cheapness of communication. It is impossible for us to treat our island as a little world by itself, cut off from the rest of mankind, having rights indeed over other nations, but subject to no obligations towards them. Steam navigation and railways, and the electric telegraph, have settled that question. Now in this case the danger was real and not imaginary. It was not a mere pasquinade or lampoon in a newspaper; but it was a murderous and desperate attempt on the Emperor's life, which was unquestionably contrived and prepared in this country. It has been said that the late Government was *obsequious* to the Emperor. Now, if it had been a mere question of feeling—if mere dignity and outward respect had been violated—their conduct might have been open to the reproach of obsequiousness: but this was a question of danger to life. Why is it that political exiles, entertaining revolutionary designs, congregate in England, rather than seek a refuge in the United States, or in an English colony? It is because they are close to the Continent, and that they can transfer themselves to any place at the shortest notice, where they may desire to be present, and where any opportunity may offer itself. Whatever may be thought of the character and tendency of Louis Napoleon's rule, it cannot be disputed that in this case he had serious interests at stake, which justified a suitable representation to our Government.

How far a 'spirited' foreign policy—a policy regardless of the personal safety of foreign sovereigns, has been formerly thought essential to the dignity of this country, on similar occasions, may be inferred from the conduct of Mr. Fox in 1806. In the early part of that year, when we were at war with France, a Frenchman named Guillet de la Gevriillière made to Mr. Fox an offer to kill the Emperor Napoleon; from a house at Passy, from which, it was stated, the design could be carried into effect with certainty, and without risk. At this time Napoleon was the most formidable and determined enemy of England. What did Mr. Fox do? he ordered the man to be detained; he wrote to inform M. de Talleyrand, the French Foreign Minister, of the fact, and he added:—

'At all events, I thought it right to acquaint you with what had happened, before I sent him away. Our laws do not permit us to detain him long, but he shall not be sent away till after you shall have had full time to take precautions against his attempts, supposing



him still to entertain bad designs; and, when he goes, I shall take care to have him landed at a seaport as remote as possible from France.\*

The Government being at that time, under the Alien Act, armed with a discretionary power over aliens; such was the course which Mr. Fox took under that Act, for protecting the person of a despotic sovereign at war with this country, and known to entertain feelings of the most bitter hostility against it. It will be observed that the man who made this offer had not gone so far as the late conspirators in this country; for he had taken no active step in furtherance of his design.

But another event, which occurred near the beginning of the century, has been much insisted on by the newspapers, and has been even pressed into the service of parliamentary argument, as a model of spirited resistance to foreign dictation. This example of manly and vigorous foreign policy is, strange to say, derived from the Minister who negotiated the Peace of Amiens — that peace at which, according to Sheridan, every man rejoiced, and of which every man was ashamed. The definitive treaty of Amiens was signed in March, 1802; a warlike message from the Crown was brought down to both Houses in March, 1803. The intermediate time was occupied with ill-concealed distrust between the two Governments, and with attempts on Napoleon's part to throw upon England the blame of a rupture of the peace. Much irritation in particular existed in his mind on account of the attacks made upon him in newspapers published in this country. In August, 1802, M. Otto, the French chargé d'affaires in London, addressed to the Secretary of State, Lord Hawkesbury, a long note, in which he complained of the licentiousness of the English press, and made the following specific demands upon the British Government: —

1. That His Majesty's Government would adopt effectual measures for putting a stop to the unbecoming and seditious publications of the English press.
2. That certain individuals should be sent out of the island of Jersey.
3. That the bishops of Arras and St. Pol de Leon should be sent away.
4. That Georges and his adherents should be transported to Canada.
5. That the princes of the house of Bourbon should be recommended to repair to Warsaw.
6. That any emigrants who wore the orders of the old French Government should be sent away.

Now it will be observed that the two Governments were at this time on most unfriendly and suspicious terms, that they

---

\* Ann. Reg. for 1806, p. 708.

were in fact on the verge of war, and that all amicable oral explanation between their respective representatives was out of the question.\* The only course open to Lord Hawkesbury was to send a formal written reply; but instead of assuming an indignant tone upon the receipt of demands, which may be truly characterised as savouring of dictation, he writes a long argumentative and almost apologetic despatch, justifying refusal in some cases, but complying with the requisitions in others.

The first part of the despatch relates to the liberty of the press, with respect to which Lord Hawkesbury refuses to take any measures for altering the law of England. On the other points, however, he shows more disposition to comply with the demands of the French Government. Indeed when we consider the relations between the two Governments at that time, the insolent career of dictation and aggression which Napoleon was pursuing on the Continent, and the tone of M. Otto's demands, we must be permitted to regard Lord Hawkesbury's answer as the very reverse of 'spirited.' He refuses indeed to muzzle the English press, but he consents to enforce the Alien Act against Georges and his adherents, and to send them out of the country; he is prepared to do the same with the two French bishops, if they have circulated papers inducing the people in their old dioceses to resist the new church establishment; he announces the King's wish that the Bourbon princes should not continue to reside in this country, *if they are disposed, or can be induced to quit it*; but he will not send them away under the Alien Act, if they conduct themselves in a peaceable manner.† Suppose that an Alien Act were now in

---

\* In fact, neither Power had sent as yet an ambassador since the signing of the peace. It was not till the month of November that General Andréossy and Lord Whitworth went to their respective posts, where they only remained a few months.

† Ann. Reg. for 1803, pp. 661-9. It may be remarked that the views expressed in this despatch, as to the inapplicability of an Alien Act to foreigners plotting against *their own* Government, are exactly similar to the view adopted and acted upon by the late Ministry. 'With respect (he says) to the distinction which appeared to be drawn in M. Otto's Note, between the publications of British subjects and those of foreigners, and the power which His Majesty is supposed to have, in consequence of the Alien Act, of sending foreigners out of his dominions, it is important to observe that the provisions of that Act were made for the purpose of preventing the residence of foreigners, whose numbers and principles had a tendency to disturb the internal peace of his own dominions, and whom the safety of those dominions might require in many instances to be removed, even if their actual conduct had not exposed them to punish-

force, and that Louis Napoleon had addressed to the late Government a requisition to send the princes of the house of Orleans out of the country; would it have been thought a spirited answer, would it not have been thought a mean and creeping and cowardly answer,—even to a friendly and sincerely,—if Lord Clarendon had informed Count Walewski that the Queen's desire was that the Orleans princes should not continue to reside in the country, if they could be induced to quit it, but that Her Majesty was unwilling to send them away under the Alien Act, so long as their conduct was quiet, and they abstained from disturbing our foreign relations?

It is a principle of our Common Law that all acts which by insulting the dignity, and still more by threatening the persons of foreign sovereigns, tend to embroil our Government with foreign nations, are criminal, and punishable as a misdemeanor.

Every publication (said Lord Ellenborough, in *Peltier's case*) that had a tendency to promote public mischief, by reflecting on the characters of magistrates and others in high and eminent situations of power and dignity, and in such terms, and in such a manner, as had a direct tendency to interrupt the amity and friendship that subsisted between the two countries, was what the law called a libel. If there were contained in any publication *a plain and manifest incitement and persuasion to assassinate or destroy the persons of such magistrates*, and if the tendency of such publication was to interrupt the harmony that subsisted between different nations, the libel was still more criminal.

It is therefore evident that if any alteration in our criminal code should afford such additional securities against conspiracies in this country to murder foreigners, whether sovereigns or not, as might tend to prevent misunderstandings with foreign Governments, it would be in accordance with the existing policy of our ancient Common Law.

It is laid down by writers on the law of nations that the subjects of a neutral country ought to be prevented from enlisting in the service of any belligerent Power, and that the equipment in its ports of armaments in aid of any such Power ought to be prohibited. Such has been and is the policy of our Foreign Enlistment Acts. But if we ought not to allow our ports to be used as a convenience by a foreign Power for fitting out an

---

ment by law. It does not follow that it would be a warrantable application of such a law to exert its powers in the cases of individuals, such as those of whom complaint is now made, and particularly as they are liable to be prosecuted under the law of the land, in the manner as others have been in similar cases, at the instance upon the complaint of foreign Governments?

expedition against a country at peace with us; so, by parity of reasoning, our laws ought to make provision, as far as is practicable, against the abuse of the right of political asylum for the purpose of contriving and preparing the assassination of foreign sovereigns. It was with this view that the Conspiracy Bill of the late Government was proposed, and its introduction was sanctioned by a large majority of the House of Commons.

We hold it therefore as proved that, looking at the substance and essential character of this transaction, and regarding the question as one not of impulse and passion and sentiment, but of reason, there is no ground for saying that the French Government exceeded their legitimate rights, or that the English Government made any concession which was inconsistent with international law and with our own constitutional practice, or which placed the honour and dignity of the country in jeopardy. But we have now to consider another and a different objection, one founded not on the substance, but on the form; an objection limited to manner, and tone, and procedure. It is alleged that a grave error was committed by the late Government in not giving a written reply to Count Walewski's despatch. Now, in the first place, we must point out an ambiguity in the resolution of censure passed by the House of Commons, which was probably not unintentional, but was meant to be deceptive. It laments that 'some reply' was not given to the despatch. Now *some* reply was given; but, as the House were informed, and could not fail to know, it was given orally, and not in writing. It was given both in London and in Paris; there was no misunderstanding between the two Governments; there was no complaint, or suggestion, or surmise, or suspicion of a misunderstanding; nobody believed or pretended to believe that there was a misunderstanding; the only ground alleged was that the Government ought to have made a public protest, and have put its answer upon record. But this was a mere objection of form, unless it could be shown that the Government had made some improper concession, had given some imprudent assurance, or had failed to make their meaning understood. Looking to the importance which has been attached to the omission to send a written answer to the French Government, we do not doubt that it would have been better if an answer had been written, and laid before Parliament—the latter being its principal and, indeed, only purpose. Not the smallest difficulty as to its composition could have existed. This omission may have been an error of form, but it was nothing more than an error of form; it did not extend to the essence and spirit of the transaction, and it seems somewhat strange that

a generation of public men who pride themselves on their superiority to formalism and technicality, who abhor red-tapism and official rules, should make the fate of a Government and the maintenance of national honour depend upon the difference between a written answer and an oral answer, when it is not asserted that the substance of the answer actually made was insufficient. Much has been lately said against *secret diplomacy*, as it is called; we have no room now for the discussion of this subject; but the late Government did not introduce secret diplomacy, or increase its secrecy; they merely continued the practice which has existed hitherto in this and all other civilised countries; and if the communications which they made to the French Government were clear and unambiguous, they cannot be blamed for having made them in a manner recognised by the uniform practice of international negotiation.

There was in this transaction one point, not of form, but of substance, as to which a serious remonstrance might with sufficient reason have been addressed to the French Government. This was the insertion of the offensive regimental addresses in the 'Moniteur.' But on this head the Emperor's explanation was accepted as satisfactory, and the House did not regard the national honour as wounded in this direction. We may be permitted here to remark, that though we do not wish to constitute ourselves the defenders of the French colonels, we think that the true character of their *fanfaronnade* ought not to be misconceived. It is clear that their object was not to insult England, to foment war, or to expose themselves to any real peril. They did not expect to be taken at their word. What they meant was, to use a hyperbolical phrase for signifying their devotion to the reigning Emperor and his dynasty; they wished to convey to him that they were ready to do and suffer all things for his sake; and those who bid the highest in this auction of flattery might hope to obtain the solid reward of promotion. This natural feeling in favour of themselves, and not a desire to disturb the peace of Europe, was plainly the motive which dictated the addresses which John Bull has taken so much to heart, and which were undoubtedly in the worst tone of French military swagger.

The correspondence which has passed between Lord Malmesbury and Count Walewski, since the change of Government, is simply insignificant. The new Ministry have undertaken to explain what was not really misunderstood, and to remove a difficulty which did not really exist. All this has been done amidst a loud flourish of their own trumpets, and a prodigious clatter of self-applause and self-gratulation: but the result

has been in truth a negative quantity. They have plainly been studying, (and, it must be acknowledged, with success) Lord Bacon's Essay on 'Seeming Wise,' for there has been only the semblance, without the reality of wisdom.\* The only pretence for the existence of the 'painful misconceptions,' alleged by Mr. Disraeli, was the intentional perversion of the meaning of the French despatch made by some of his own political friends for party purposes. There was no misconception between the two Governments. The late Ministers knew well, and repeatedly stated, that it was the political refugees in this country, and not native Englishmen, who were the object of the suspicion of the Emperor's Government; and that it was the alleged existence of an officina of assassination kept by exiles in England, which excited their alarm. If any sincere doubt, on the part of any well-informed man, existed on this subject, it would have been dispelled by the distinct and complete explanation in Count Walewski's despatch to Lord Clarendon, dated Feb. 23rd, and received Feb. 24th, more than a week before the date of Lord Malmesbury's despatch. The subsequent demand for explanation, and the cold, stately, and unbending answer of Count Walewski, in which all the material contents of the former despatch (including what were called its offensive expressions) are carefully repeated and re-affirmed, amount in fact to a mere comedy, as far as any practical effect is concerned. The attempt of the present Ministers to represent themselves as having removed a misunderstanding with the French Government and vindicated the national honour, is a deliberate imposture.† All that they have really done is to drop or to suspend the Conspiracy Bill of the late Government, of which Lord Derby had openly approved, and

---

\* Lord Bacon says: 'There is no decaying merchant, or inward beggar, hath so many tricks to uphold the credit of their wealth, as those empty persons have to maintain the credit of their sufficiency. Seeming wise men may make shift to get opinion; but let no man choose them for employment.'

† Lord Malmesbury, in his despatch of March 4., adverting to the previous despatch of Count Walewski to Lord Clarendon, of February 23., says:—

'Though Her Majesty's Government have, *from the first*, entertained the belief that an erroneous construction had been put on Count Walewski's despatch, they receive with the highest satisfaction the voluntary repudiation, so honourable to His Excellency, of the meaning which he believes to have been attributed to him.'

Lord Malmesbury therefore avows that the present Government never shared in the alleged misconception.

which his party had, on its introduction, supported in the House of Commons. Wide differences of opinion respecting the criminality of such acts as have recently been committed prevail among the ablest expositors of our law. The subject will be elucidated by the approaching trial of Bernard; but if lawyers of eminence considered the present law sufficient, this was a reason for inquiry, or for awaiting the event of the trial, but not for censuring the late Government for omitting to send a written answer to a despatch, which had been fully and clearly answered by oral communications. As to a vindication of the national honour, we trust that those who sympathise with political refugees, who hate foreign despots, who seek to promote by all means in their power the cause of liberty on the Continent, and who talk of the *obsequiousness* of the late Government, will derive comfort and satisfaction from the fulsome adulation which Lord Derby and some of his colleagues have recently poured upon the Emperor Louis Napoleon—adulation, which from the energy of its hyperboles must fill even M. Gravier de Cassagnac with envy. We confess that language of this sort, coming from Ministers of the Crown, seems to us far more derogatory to the national honour than either the omission to give a written answer to a despatch, or the introduction of a bill to amend the law of conspiracy. We may here remark that if any hopes were held out to the French ambassador by Lord Derby, on his accession to office, that he would, in accordance with his former expressed opinion, proceed with the Conspiracy Bill, his promise was speedily revoked, and was never fulfilled.

The late change of Administration has been adverted to in the French newspapers as a proof of a failure of the Parliamentary system of Government; and it is true that in this case a Ministry possessing the general confidence of the country was, through a 'painful misconception,' and a transient burst of popular passion, overthrown. The Liberal party, on account of a partial difference of opinion, thought it desirable to pass a self-denying ordinance, and to transfer the sceptre of executive power to their opponents, although they had an unquestionable majority in the House of Commons. Some persons may be inclined to attribute this result to the insufficient strength of the Executive in the House of Commons, owing to the operation of the Reform Act, on which Lord Grey has dwelt with so much force in his recent work on Parliamentary Government.\*. We confess,

---

\* See Lord Grey's 'Essay on Parliamentary Government, considered with reference to Reform of Parliament,' pp. 98-103.

however, that we think this explanation, though partially true, inadequate to the case. The Executive Government for the time being may be considered partly as the plenipotentiaries of Parliament, as holding (subject to subsequent censure and disavowal) their proxy and full powers; partly as negotiators with Parliament, and as proposing to them the terms of an arrangement about which they are hereafter to come to an agreement. Now for action in either of these capacities, it is important that there should be certain recognised principles of conduct, and that the probable views of Parliament upon each matter to be decided should admit of reasonable anticipation. Without this guide an Administration can scarcely conduct their daily executive duties concerning home policy; direct negotiations, and conclude engagements with foreign Powers, deal with questions relating to India and the colonies, or prepare schemes of finance or of legislative reform, subject to the review or ultimate consent of Parliament. No court of justice could guide its decisions by any uniform or intelligible standard, if its judgments were revised by a Court of Appeal which decided, not according to fixed rules, but according to arbitrary and discretionary principles, dependent on the momentary caprice of its members. Now with respect to questions of domestic policy — with respect to commercial or financial questions — with respect even to questions of Indian and colonial policy — there are certain principles of conduct, which, though not universally or constantly recognised, yet receive so general and so steady a deference, that a Government can with tolerable safety calculate upon their predominance. But this is not the case with foreign politics: with respect to the maxims for regulating our relations with foreign States, there is the utmost anarchy of opinion. In this department there is a want of well established and generally recognised principles, and a consequent fluctuation and instability of judgment in Parliament — a tendency to veer from one point of the compass to another without any rational ground which can be conjectured beforehand. With regard, therefore, to questions of foreign politics, it is scarcely possible for a Government to conduct itself, so as to avoid coming into collision with Parliament, because Parliament has on this subject no fixed principle of action; it is blown about by every transient wind of popular doctrine — it is influenced by every ingenious or declamatory speech. It therefore condemns at one time a policy which it had previously approved, and approves at another a policy which it had previously condemned.



‘Quod petiit, spernit, repetit, quod nuper omisit ;  
Æstuat, et vitæ disconvenit ordine toto.’

In 1857, Lord Palmerston's foreign policy was blamed as turbulent and aggressive; it was strongly condemned and opposed on this ground by the representatives of peace principles; and the House of Commons, upon the motion of Mr. Cobden, passed a vote of censure on his Government for sanctioning the ‘violent measures’ of Sir J. Bowring at Canton. In 1858, Lord Palmerston is condemned for not resenting the language of a despatch from Count Walewski, when the conduct of the French Government is not complained of, and when nothing but a written protest is said to have been needed; he is censured in a formal vote of Parliament, for not being sufficiently prompt in vindicating the honour of the country against a supposed affront which was not even alleged to consist in any act, and which has since been acknowledged by Lord Malmesbury to have been founded on a misconstruction of the meaning; whereas the leading complaint on former occasions was that he was quarrelsome and unconciliatory, too quick in resenting apparent affronts, and over-jealous and over-punctilious in matters in which the national honour was concerned. Who could have supposed that the House, after censuring Lord Palmerston for being too warlike in March, 1857, would censure him for not being sufficiently warlike in February, 1858; and that both motions would be made by leading members of the Peace Party? In the debate on the Address for the Peace, in May, 1856, Mr. Milner Gibson read to the House of Commons, amidst general laughter and applause, the following admirable and characteristic passage from one of Sydney Smith's letters, which we are glad to have an opportunity of repeating:—

‘For God's sake do not drag me into another war. I am worn down and worn out with crusading, and defending Europe and protecting mankind; I must think a little of myself. I am sorry for the Spaniards; I am sorry for the Greeks; I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Bagdad is oppressed; I do not like the present state of the Delta; Thibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight for all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be the champion of the Decalogus, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid the consequence will be that we shall cut each other's throats. No war; dear Lady Grey, no eloquence; but apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic! I beseech you secure Lord Grey's sword and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote's armour.’

Now could it have been believed that the member who commended this passage to the House would be the leader in censuring Lord Palmerston for not vindicating the national honour against the French Emperor; for not resenting the insults of his Ministers; for not throwing his shield over political refugees suspected of conspiracy; and for not assisting Mazzini and Ledru Rollin in their crusade for the regeneration of Europe? Is this the man who proscribes eloquence, and enjoins apathy, selfishness, common sense, and arithmetic, where the cause of liberty in foreign States is concerned, and who treats it as a Quixotic delusion to fit out armaments for the assistance of foreign liberals?

It is important that the means by which the present Administration acquired office should be clearly understood, that no illusion should exist as to the character of the transaction, and that the conduct of the 'great Conservative party,' and of its leaders, should be exhibited in its true light. We have therefore followed this not very attractive subject through its various windings; but by whatever means obtained, the executive power is now in the hands of Lord Derby and his friends, and the important question is, how they are likely to use it?

Lord Macaulay, in his speech at Edinburgh, in November, 1852, in attempting to predict the probable conduct of the First Derby Ministry, used the following words: —

'On the whole, what I do expect is that they will offer a pertinacious, vehement, provoking opposition to safe and reasonable change; and that then, in some moment of fear or caprice, they will bring in, and fling on the table, in a fit of desperation or levity, some plan which will loosen the very foundations of society.'

As to the recklessness and levity to be expected of the present Ministers, when their maintenance in office may be in question, we think that Lord Macaulay's prediction holds good now, not less than in 1852; but as to their offering a pertinacious opposition to any change, reasonable or unreasonable, which the majority of the House may desire to force upon them, we confess that we entertain no apprehension. The rapidity with which they adopted the principles of the India Bill of the late Government, which (as we have shown) they had opposed up to the last moment; and their alacrity in promising a Reform Bill for the next session, are two circumstances which leave no doubt of their flexibility, and of their readiness to change their most recent and strongest opinions, for the sake of obtaining the votes of their opponents. It is clear that the second Derby Ministry is to be conducted on the principle of a general sur-

render. Sir R. Peel's conduct, with respect to the Catholic question and the Corn Laws, is to be erected into a universal maxim, and to be extended to the whole circle of political questions. Lord Derby has laid it down formally that Conservatism involves the principle of progress; and that the difference between Conservatives and Liberals is only a difference of degree. Lord J. Manners has declared that the principle of the present Government is 'Rational Toryism.' Now, it seems to us that this phrase resembles what painters call 'Still life;' that is to say, animals which were alive, but are so no longer. A genuine Tory is, in our view, essentially irrational. He holds to what is because it is. This variety of politician is not without its use. There is such a thing as the irrational desire of change. An irrational desire of change may be usefully counteracted by an irrational desire of keeping things unchanged. But when once the Tory becomes rational, and discriminates between what is good and what is bad, he loses the distinctive attributes of Toryism. A rational Tory bears a close resemblance to a Whig.

Armed with this potent principle of adaptation—being rational Tories and Conservatives who admit the doctrine of progress—and having emancipated themselves from the inconvenient trammels of consistency to former opinions—Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli can have comparatively little difficulty in dealing with the business of the session. The army and navy estimates had been prepared with care, and were on the table of the House; the new Government have already obtained votes on account for these two services, and will probably not make any material change in their predecessors' work. Assuming that these estimates are adopted by the House, a large provision will have to be made for the ways and means of the financial year, beginning on the 1st of April, 1858. The income tax reverts on that day to the rate fixed by the Act of 1853, and 2,000,000*l.* of exchequer bonds fall due in May. The duty of making the requisite provision for the finances of the coming year will fall on the new Chancellor of the Exchequer. We presume that he will not attempt to revive the principles of Protection; nor is it very likely that he will resuscitate the Budget of 1852, and propose a graduated income tax, and a reduction of the malt tax. So little, indeed, does he appear to hold to the principles of his own Budget, that, at the beginning of the session of 1857, he announced his intention of moving a resolution, binding the House to the principles of Mr. Gladstone's Budget of 1853, which were in direct contradiction to those on which his own plan had been founded.

‘I think (he said, Feb. 4.) my course will be to move for a committee of the whole House in order that I may introduce resolutions. My first resolution will be to express the opinion of this House, that taxes which have been granted in time of war for the purpose of carrying on hostilities, by way of income tax, should not be levied in a period of what we are assured by the honourable mover of the Address is one of profound peace. My second resolution—of course I am not pretending to give the language I should lay upon the table of the House—will be that the House should express its opinion that the settlement of 1853, of the right honourable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford (Mr. Gladstone), should in spirit be adhered to.’

We await, with some curiosity, the promulgation of the plan in which Mr. Disraeli’s various financial doctrines will be at once exemplified and reconciled with each other. With respect to the income tax, nothing has been predetermined, and he has the fullest opportunity of enforcing a strict fulfilment of the compact of 1853. His opinions on the Bank Act will probably remain in a state of suspended animation for the present; and we do not expect his plan of currency reform until 1859, notwithstanding his eagerness for immediate legislation in December last.

The present Ministry, having opposed the India Bill of the late Government, and condemned its principle, now adopt its principle, on the ground that it has been approved by a large majority of the House of Commons. The objections which they made to it were, in truth, too fundamental and deep-seated to be removed by the approbation of any majority; however, Lord Derby and his colleagues seem not to have hesitated as to this abandonment of their recently expressed opinions. In their new Bill they have adopted the general plan upon which the Bill of their predecessors was framed;—direct government by the Queen, abolition of the political functions of the Company, and the formation of a Consultative Council, destitute of independent power, in immediate contact with the Indian Minister. In these material respects, and in the provisions respecting patronage, the two Bills are identical; in fact, the greater part of the first Bill is almost literally transferred into the second. But while the new Ministers substantially appropriated the measure of their predecessors, their fear of being charged with plagiarism, and their love of showy originality, induced them to alter the former Bill and to treat it (in Sheridan’s words) as gypsies do stolen children; they disfigured it in order to make it pass for their own. The material deviation from the first Bill which they have made is in the constitution of the Council; and in this, it must be confessed, they have disported themselves with a levity.

an ability, and an absence of restraint which must relieve them from all imputation of a servile adoption of the ideas of others. In determining the constitution of the Council, they have introduced a fundamentally new principle, not only unlike anything in the Bill of the late Ministry, but unlike anything which exists, or ever existed, in the Indian Government; unlike anything which was ever proposed or thought of for the Indian Government, unlike anything which ever existed in any Colonial Government, and unlike anything which ever existed in the Imperial Government. A brief explanation will suffice to display the true character of this notable proposition.

The East India Company was originally an ordinary joint stock company. Its object was trade with India and China, the trade was carried on by the capital of the proprietors, and the proprietors had the usual powers of proprietors of joint stock companies, among which was that of electing their directors. In this state their powers continued until the Act of 1793, which (with certain reservations) abolished all their powers except those relating to trade and the election of directors, and declared all acts done by the Court of Directors, with the consent of the Board of Control, to be final. The proprietors, thus shorn of all direct power over the government of India, retained their other powers intact until the Act of 1833, which abolished the trade of the Company. Since that time they have been electors, destitute of all substantial interest in India, inasmuch as the dividend on their stock is fixed by law, can neither be increased nor diminished, is made a first charge on the revenues of India, and is guaranteed by Parliament; and they are prohibited from carrying on the trade for which their capital was originally subscribed. The position of the proprietors of East India stock, as electors of the Court of Directors, has since 1833 been anomalous, on account of the withdrawal of the ground upon which their electoral function was originally based. But Parliament did not create any new element of election, it continued what was in existence; and whatever interest the proprietors had was an Indian, and not an English interest. In the composition of the peculiar government of India, no purely English element intervened directly except the Crown and the Parliament. In this respect it was in complete analogy with the proprietary governments which formerly existed in some of the American colonies, and with the more recent proprietary government of New Zealand, and, indeed, with the general system of our colonial governments.

In the Bill of the late Government there was nothing to contravene this principle. The Court of Directors, and the elective

functions of the proprietors, as being anomalous and inconvenient, were abolished; and an Indian Council was substituted, consisting of eight members, holding their offices during good behaviour for six years, re-eligible, and nominated by the Crown. The qualification for each councillor was the same, namely, that of having been a director of the East India Company, or for ten years in India in the service of the Crown or Company, or having been for fifteen years resident in India. This Council was intended to advise, not to control; to assist, not to resist; they were to form a harmonious part of the executive action of the Queen's Government, not to be an extraneous power thwarting and obstructing its measures. The details of its constitution might have been varied when the Bill came to Committee, but if its general character had been retained, it would have been in analogy with the rest of our Imperial system, as affecting the government of our dependencies, and would have been a safe, intelligible, and rational institution. Its mode of appointment would likewise have been in analogy with that of one-third of the Court of Directors, as fixed by the Act of 1853.

The Council in the new Bill is founded on a wholly different principle; viz., that of REPRESENTATION. In order to understand how this principle is applied, we subjoin a statement of the intricate plan upon which this body is to be formed. The Council is to consist of eighteen members, nine appointed by the Crown, and nine elected. Each of the nine Crown nominees is to have a special qualification, and is to be (what Mr. Disraeli calls) 'a representative man.' Four are to be members of the Civil Service, who have served ten years in Bengal, Bombay, Madras, and the upper provinces respectively; and a fifth who has served ten years, five of them at the court of a native prince. Four are to be members of the Military Service, who have served in India for five years in the Queen's army, or for ten years in the armies of Madras, Bombay, and Bengal, respectively. These nine members are to be, in the first instance, named in the Bill. With respect to the elected members, four must possess the following qualifications; viz., service for ten years under the Crown or Local Government in India, civil or military; and residence in India for fifteen years, combined with employment in agriculture, manufactures, or commerce. These four councillors are to be elected by a constituency estimated to amount to 5000 persons, and composed as follows: 1. Of every person who has borne the commission of the Queen, or of the Indian Government, during ten years' residence in India. 2. Of every person who has been in the Civil Service of

India during ten years' residence, 3. Every registered proprietor of 2000*l.* stock of Indian railways, or other public work. 4. Every proprietor of 1000*l.* Indian Stock. These four elective councillors are, in the first instance, to be named in the Bill. For the five remaining elective councillors the qualification is to be employment in commerce with India, or in the exportation of manufactured articles to that country for five years, or residence in India for ten years. The electors are to be the parliamentary constituencies of London, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, and Belfast.

With respect to the nine nominated members of the Council, there is little difference between their qualification and that of the councillors of the first Bill, except that the new Bill, for the purpose of making them 'representative men,' imposes a special qualification upon each, namely, that he shall belong to the civil or military service of a particular presidency, or that he shall have resided five years at the court of a native prince. This condition, introduced in order to invest the councillors with a representative character, must operate mischievously by narrowing the field of choice, already much restricted. Suppose, for example, that a military councillor from Bombay were to resign; the best man for the vacancy might have belonged to the Bengal or Madras army; but he would be ineligible, and an inferior man from the other presidency must be appointed. What would be said to a regulation that one Secretary of State must be taken from Yorkshire, another from Middlesex, and a third from Lanarkshire? For executive functions, where the Crown appoints, such a territorial qualification is wholly inapplicable. This excrescence upon the original Bill ought, therefore, to be excised. With regard to the qualification of residence for five years at the court of a native prince, we are wholly unable to comprehend how it affords any protection to native princes, or why a civil servant, who has resided for five years at a single native court should be supposed to have a general acquaintance and a general sympathy with the courts of all the native princes of India. It is possible that his experience may have led him to think ill, not to think well, of the private life and the public acts of the native princes. In this case the 'representative man' would represent the native princes very much in the sense in which Napoleon represented Italy, and Spain, and Germany; or in which a wolf would represent a flock of sheep. It should be observed that the simple qualifications of the first Bill, independent of Indian territorial divisions, is similar to that required by the Act of 1853, for the Directors nominated by the Crown.

We now come to the elective branch of this representative Council; and first to the four councillors elected by the constituency of 5000. We have already explained the absurdity involved in the continuance of the elective functions of the proprietors of India stock, after their trade had ceased, and their dividend been permanently fixed and guaranteed by Parliament. It is now proposed not only to perpetuate this absurdity, but to extend it, by giving similar rights to proprietors of India railway stock (likewise guaranteed by the Indian Government), and also to all persons who have been in the civil or military service of India for ten years. With regard to India stock and India railway shares, these are mere investments, often held by women; they imply no knowledge of India, and but little interest in its good government. The retired civil and military servants may have a competent knowledge of India, but their sympathies, where the interests of India and England conflict, or appear to conflict, are not likely to be on the side of India; so that if by representation is meant a representation of the interests of India, these 'representative men' will be found wanting. It may be added that if the patronage of the councillors is valuable, shares will be purchased in Indian companies in order to obtain a right of voting.

There remain the five councillors elected by town constituencies in the United Kingdom. This is the leading feature in the Council created by the new Bill; it is a complete novelty in the constitution of the Indian Government; and it seems to us to be as unsound and mischievous as it is novel. We hold that the direct election by popular English constituencies of members of the Indian Executive Government violates almost every principle which ought to be held sacred in constituting the Government of India. In the first place, it violates the essential character of the subordinate government of a dependency, which consists in its separateness, so far as is consistent with the dependence. The Imperial Government ought only to come into contact with the government of its dependencies as a government. The relations between England and its colonies are all through the Crown and Parliament; and the same is the case with India, if we except the anomalous election by the proprietors of India stock. Election of Indian councillors by the parliamentary voters of London and Liverpool and Belfast, completely overturns this principle; it destroys the separate character of the Indian subordinate government, and mixes it up with the constitution of the Imperial Government of England. This is bad for India, and bad for England. It is a radically vicious principle; it is fraught with peril for



India,, but it is peculiarly mischievous as regards our own constitution. It is an insidious blow to Parliamentary purity; it is a temptation to voters, in the shape of election of salaried officers with patronage to distribute. Many have been the plans for disposing of Indian patronage so as to neutralize its corrupting influence; but this plan of converting it into a bait for large popular constituencies is altogether unprecedented. We believe that the voters of the large towns will spurn the paltry bribe; but if unhappily this pernicious proposition were to become law, we must not expect it to remain long within these modest dimensions. When five executive officers, with salaries of 1000*l.* a year, and numerous appointments to bestow, are elected by the freemen and 10*l.* householders of Liverpool, other large towns will put in their claim. Birmingham will ask for a Lord of the Admiralty; Leeds may prefer an Under-Secretary; Hull may elect for a Commissioner of Customs; while the Dublin voters will doubtless insist on choosing the Lord Lieutenant. The counties will not be behind in the race. Sussex may require the right of appointing the President of the Poor Law Board, and the West Riding will probably be satisfied with nothing less than a Secretary of State. If Fox's India Bill was objectionable, as interfering with the prerogative of the Crown, the objections to this Bill, on the same ground, are a hundred times more formidable. The names in his Bill were at least determined by Parliament, and inserted in an Act to be passed by King, Lords, and Commons; whereas Lord Derby proposes that similar appointments should be made by the voters of a single town.

Apart, however, from these grave, and, as we think, conclusive objections on constitutional grounds, what are we to say of the prudence of a proposal which, by mixing up the English and Indian Governments in so tangled a skein, gives some colour for asserting, that the Imperial Government is liable for the pecuniary obligations of the Indian Government; and, at any rate, increases enormously the moral claim for financial assistance, in the event of any disastrous consequences arising from the blunders or caprices of this heterogeneous Council? Hitherto the finances of England and India have been kept quite distinct. Parliament has been most careful in its language on this subject; nor was there the slightest ground for the alarms raised by Mr. Disraeli about the financial effect of the Bill of the late Government; but if anything is likely to bring about this danger in a real form, it would be the election of Indian Councillors and English members of Parliament by the same constituency.

All this folly and absurdity has proceeded from one central

error: the attempt to apply the principle of *representation* to the Council. We have shown that the endeavour to make the Crown nominees 'representative men,' only tends to a mischievous and capricious restriction of the field of choice. We have also shown that the election by holders of India stock and Indian railway shares, and by retired civil and military servants, does not supply the true elements of a representative system, viz., interest and knowledge, and that to call them the representatives of the native population of India is an insult to our common sense. It is, however, in the election by the parliamentary voters of the large towns that the fallaciousness of this attempt is most apparent. Interest is of the essence of representation for political purposes; and it is a flagrant abuse of terms to say that because the voters of London are competent to elect a representative for the British Parliament, they are, therefore, competent to elect a representative for the Council of India. These nominees of English towns might be elected to promote interests directly hostile to Indian interests; and, backed by large popular bodies, they might be able to dictate to the Indian Minister, and to exercise an influence in his council wholly disproportioned to their numerical weight. The relation in which the Imperial Government stands towards a large dependency, as an arbitrator between imperial and provincial interests, is always a difficult one; but if its councillors are to be not impartial persons, selected on account of their special knowledge and experience, but the delegates of powerful classes and interests in the paramount country, it is impossible that the balance should be held with an even hand. The Indian Minister will shrug his shoulders, and exclaim *Væ victis!* when the Gaul of London or Glasgow throws his sword into the anti-Indian scale. It is impossible to give free and really representative institutions to India. All persons who understand the oriental character must be aware that such a mode of government is wholly unsuited to their state of civilisation. There need be no reluctance to make this admission — but because India cannot be governed like Canada or Australia, there is no reason for attempting to set up a spurious imitation of a representative government, which is wanting in all that characterises political representation except its incidental evils.

Another consequence of this misplaced introduction of the principle of Representation is, that it reestablishes and perpetuates the Double Government, in an aggravated form. The present system is cumbrous and circuitous; it encourages procrastination, and weakens responsibility, but the Directors

have no real power, and a determined President can always overrule them. When, however, the Councillors are avowedly invested by the Legislature with a representative character, they will be entitled to contend for the interests of their constituents. The government of India must be conducted on the theory of a compromise; the President must make the best terms for the public which he can extort from the Councillors; authority will be more divided, and the seat of responsibility more obscure than ever. Whatever may be the defects of the present form of the home Government of India — and they are serious — we prefer it infinitely to the system which would be created by the new Bill.

For the insertion of the names of the Crown-nominees in the Bill, at the first constitution of the Council, there are precedents: but why the constituency of 5000 are to be deprived of their first election we do not understand. The proposal of a list of names is meant to appear as a concession to Parliament, but it, in fact, gives them little option, and we should prefer to see the selection of the nine councillors left to the responsible advisers of the Crown. The character of the names proposed is not such as to justify the departure from the ordinary mode of selecting persons for executive appointments.

The new Bill further contains a clause for the appointment of a Royal Commission, consisting of three persons, to inquire into the finances of India. This plan is obviously inserted, in order to create the semblance of an adoption of Mr. Disraeli's plan of a Royal Commission. His plan, however, was of a much more extensive nature; it implied the supersession of the Governor-General and his Council, and the substitution of a new power for remodelling the entire civil administration of India. The financial difficulties of India arise out of causes which a financial commission could not deal with; and we see no sufficient reason for taking the inquiry, if it be needed, out of the hands of the local government.

With regard to the patronage, about which so much alarm has been expressed, and which has been regarded as something not intended for securing good service for India, but as plunder to be divided among the English public — which has been described as the 'heritage of the middle classes of Great Britain' — the new Bill does not profess to do anything different from its predecessor.

We have now stated, as succinctly as we were able, the most prominent objections to this dangerous Bill. They might easily be multiplied and strengthened: but what we have said seems to us sufficient to prove that this measure involves a new

principle which would be equally detrimental to England and to India, and that its adoption as law would produce deep and lasting mischief to both countries.

So complete, indeed, has been the failure of the artifices resorted to for investing the Bill with popular attributes, that we expect to see all its characteristic provisions abandoned by the Government before the second reading. Such a course, however, will not restore them to the position which they held before they proposed their measure. It will be regarded as an admission of error in a matter of high importance, and they will be held to have evinced both arrogance and want of judgment in producing as amendments upon the Bill of their predecessors, innovations distinguished by nothing but their extravagance.

The Reform Bill is not promised until next session. It seems strange that a Cabinet containing Lord Salisbury, Lord Hardwicke, Mr. Henley, and Lord J. Manners should, within a few days of accepting office, have agreed to the principle that the existing Reform Act is narrow and insufficient, and that a large and comprehensive measure of ulterior reform is needed, in order to supply its shortcomings. From this sample we may judge of their powers of tergiversation, and may estimate their capacity for adapting themselves to the circumstances of their position. For we infer from Mr. Disraeli's repeated denunciations of the Reform Act of 1832 as a party job, that Lord Derby's Reform Bill will not be a party job—that it will not be a contrivance for increasing the Conservative power by multiplying county members; but that it will be a *bonâ fide* measure of popular reform.

The new Ministers cannot pretend to say that they were called to assist the Crown in a moment of emergency. The Exchequer was full; the defences of the country (as they themselves have admitted) were adequate; the Indian mutiny was nearly suppressed; Yeh had been captured, and Canton had submitted; our foreign relations were tranquil. They took advantage of a schism in the Liberal party to turn out the late Government. They sought office, and they found it. Having obtained office, not by a preponderance of their own numbers, but through a temporary dissension in the Liberal ranks, they can only keep it on condition of adopting the measures and acquiescing in the policy of their opponents. They do not hold office on a free tenure. They must do suit and service to their masters, if they wish to retain possession. They must renounce their distinctive opinions; they must subscribe the Whig test, and be passed under the Liberal yoke. It will be an edifying spectacle to see the Conservative Ministers sitting night after

night to be macadamised under the hammers of a Liberal majority. They will soon learn by experience what it is to legislate 'under dictation;' and they must even consent at times to become the catspaw of the Opposition for carrying measures which might perchance, if they had remained out of office, have burnt the fingers of their adversaries.

We have been careful to display the opinions recently expressed on important questions by Mr. Disraeli, because the public has been assured that he is the real Prime Minister, and it is certain that the Leader of the House of Commons must be at least equal in power to any other member of the Cabinet. Whatever may be his agility in escaping from these opinions, they at least afford a means of estimating his judgment and sense. Mr. Disraeli has been able to overthrow a government, but we doubt whether he will save an empire. We do not expect that he will have to deal with an indignant people; but we trust that he will meet with a determined Parliament, who will compel him to assume virtues which he does not possess, and to adopt a policy which, ever since he was a leader, he has been occupied in opposing. The history of the new Ministers—their course during the political discussions of the last twenty-five years—renders it necessary that they should be constantly watched, and alternately cooled and impelled, by the Opposition. Their conduct during their short tenure of office shows plainly that they will be ductile and malleable under pressure, that they will become willing instruments in the hands of their adversaries, and will even be desirous of anticipating their wishes. The danger to be apprehended is indeed the opposite to stubbornness and tenacity of opinion. Our fear is rather that, like other new converts, they may caricature the doctrines of the party to which they apostatize; that, being destitute of any sincere convictions, or clear comprehension, as to the advantages of a Liberal policy, they may propose wild and fantastic measures intended to captivate the tastes of the uneducated classes, and that though Conservatives in name, they may become Destructives in reality.

# INDEX.

*Arnold*, Dr., notice of, 182, *et seq.*

## B

*Blackie*, Professor, review of his works on Education in Scotland, 88.

*Bossuet*, memoirs of, by Abbé le Diên, reviewed, 194, *et seq.*—his birth and early life, 195—effect of his preaching in Paris, 202—his method of composition, 203—his Oraison funèbres, 205, *et seq.*—superintends the education of the Dauphin, 209—works composed by him for that purpose, 210, *et seq.*—his extravagant notions of regal power, 213—his discourse on universal history, 214—his mode of life, 219—his violent opposition to Protestantism, 220—his attack on Quiétisme, 223—his contest with Fénelon, 224—close of his life, 226—his character, 230.

*Briggs*, Lieut.-Gen., review of India and Europe compared, by, 1.

*Brougham*, Lord, review of his Speeches on Social and Political Subjects, &c., 443, *et seq.*—specimens of his eloquence, 447, *et seq.*

*Buckle*, H. T., review of his History of Civilization in England, 465, *et seq.*—his the first English attempt to treat history as a science, 465—scheme and principles of his work, 466—his theory founded on erroneous dogmas, 472, *et seq.*—he ignores metaphysics, 478—his theory opposed to morality and religion, 481, *et seq.*—fallacy of his notion that men's actions are influenced mainly by intellectual and not moral causes, 488, *et seq.*—active life underrated by him, 503, *et seq.*—immoral tendency of his theory, 507.

## C

*California*, review of works on, 295, *et seq.*—climate and vegetation of, 298—discovery of gold and its effect, 304—government of, 311—Lynch Law, 316—state of, contrasted with that of Victoria, and reasons for the contrast, 319.

*Campbell*, Lord, and Sir P. Laurie, correspondence between, 293, *note.*

*Canning*, Lord, injustice of Conservatives protesting against a vote of thanks to, 549.

*Clarendon*, Earl of, notice of his speech on the recent communications with the French Government, 556, *et seq.*

*Conspiracy Bill*, brought in by Lord Palmerston, notice of the, 555, *et seq.*

*Currency*, progress in opinion on the, from 1819 to 1844, 250, *et seq.* — Bank Act of 1844, 261 — erroneous notions as to its operation, 262 — discount banking, 263, *et seq.* — distinction between circulation and deposits, 265 — advantages of discount banking, 267 — evils attending it, 269 — evils of allowing interest on deposits, 271 — difference between crisis caused by undue advances from deposits and that caused by over-issue of notes, 272 — Act of 1844 facilitates correction of former crisis, 277 — errors of writers on monetary statistics, 282 — impolicy of engraving on Act of 1844 a discretionary relaxing power, 282, *et seq.* — the panic in America, 288.

## D

*Derby*, Lord, The second Ministry of, 540, *et seq.*

*Disraeli*, Mr., notice of his speech on the causes of the revolt in India, 545 — his opinion on the Bank Act of 1844, 552 — notice of his speech in opposition to the India Bill of Lord Palmerston, 553 — strictures on the India Bill brought in by him, 576.

## E

*Eastern Church*, review of works relating to the, 322, *et seq.* — characteristics of it, 326 — history of its development, 328 — how it became naturalised in other countries, 329 — three processes led to its formation, 330, *et seq.* — consequences of the separation of the Greek Kingdom from the Ottoman Empire, 349 — relations between it and the Reformed Churches of the West, 353.

## F

*Farnham*, Mrs., review of *California Indoors and Out, &c.*, by, 295.

*Fénélon*, notice of, 223, *et seq.*

*Fox*, C. J., *Memorials and Correspondence of*, edited by Lord J. Russell, reviewed, 134.

## H

*Hawkers' Literature of France*, its extent and character, 232.

## I

*India*, review of works on, 1, *et seq.* — dangers to British Empire in, foretold, 2, *et seq.* — disproportion between revenue and expenditure a cause of weakness of administration in, 5, *et seq.* — sources of revenue, 21, *et seq.* — burdens on the revenue, 26 — necessity of increase in military expenditure, 31 — mode for providing for this, 39, *et seq.* — development of the resources of the country, 39 — education of natives, 40 — admission of Europeans, *ibid.* — reform of legal system, 43 — public works, *ibid.* — fortifications, 44 — future government of India, 45, *et seq.*

*India Bill* of Lord Palmerston, notice of the, 575 — strictures on that of Mr. Disraeli, 576.

*Inglis, Dr.*, review of his Inaugural Discourse to the Graduates of King's College, Aberdeen, &c., 83.

## K

*Kingsley, Mr.*, notices of his works, 189, *et seq.*

*Kirkpatrick, E.*, review of The historically received Conception of the University, &c., by, 88.

## L

*Latin Christianity*, The History of, by Dean Milman, reviewed, 51.

*Laurie, Sir B.* and Lord Campbell, correspondence between, 293, note.

*Lawrence, Sir H.*, notice of, 531, *et seq.*

*Lucknow*, Narrative of the Siege of, by Mr. Rees, 513.

## M

*McCulloch*, review of his collection of The Tracts, &c. on Metallic and Paper Currency, of Lord Overstone, 248.

*Milman*, Dean, review of his History of Latin Christianity, &c., 51.

*Mouravieff, A. N.*, review of his History of the Church of Russia, 322.

## N

*Neale, Rev. J. M.*, review of his History of the Holy Eastern Church, 322.

*Nisard, C.*, review of his Histoire des Livres Populaires, ou de la Littérature du Colportage, &c., 232.

## O

*Oude*, review of General Sleeman's Journey through Oude, 513—state of, prior to its annexation, 514-23—necessity for this, 523—errors committed by the Government, 523—state of, when Sir H. Lawrence became the resident, 531—reasons for not abandoning it, 533—future policy, 539.

*Overstone, Lord*, review of his Tracts, &c. on Metallic and Paper Currency, 248.

## P

*Palmer, W.*, review of Dissertations on Subjects relating to the 'Orthodox' or 'Eastern Catholic' Communion by, 322.

*Palmerston, Lord*, sketch of events during his tenure of office, 541, *et seq.*

*Patmore, Coventry*, review of The Angel in the House, by, 121.

*Poe, E. A.*, The works and a memoir, &c. of reviewed, 419—his character and life, 419-26—his prose works, 426—his poems, 438.

*Public Schools*, influence of, 176, *et seq.*

## R

*Railways*, present state of, in Great Britain, 398, *et seq.*—capital invested in, 399—magnitude of works, *ibid.*—benefits conferred by, 400—interest of capital, 404—legislation as to, 405—duty on passengers, 409—rating of, *ibid.*—carriage of parcels by the



- Post Office on, 410—Lord Campbell's Act, 411 — mismanagement of, 412 — remuneration to directors, 417 — audit, 418.  
*Rees, Mr.*, review of his Narrative of the Siege of Lucknow, 513.  
*Russell, Lord J.*, Memorials and Correspondence of C. J. Fox, vol. iv. edited by, 134.

## S

- Scottish University Reform, 1834, et seq.* — origin of the reform movement, 88–92 — defects in the present system, 92, *et seq.* — entrance examination to universities requisite, 95 — ground of opposition, 96 — indication of the Faculty of Arts proposed, 99–109 — reorganisation of the Professors' Faculties, 109.  
*Seyd, J.*, review of his California and its Resources, 295.  
*Sleeman, General Sir W. H.*, review of his Journey through Oude, &c., 515.  
*Smiles, S.*, review of his Life of George Stephenson, 396.  
*Smith, G. H. and Nisbet*, review of their work, The Annals of San Francisco, 295.  
*Stephenson, George*, the Life of, by S. Smiles, reviewed, 396.  
*Thiers, M.*, review of his Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, 359 — his inaccuracies, 360, *et seq.* — his inaccurate account of the battle of Copenhagen, in 1801, 370 — of Nelson's attack on Boulogne, 372 — of the battle of Trafalgar, *ibid.* — of the causes of the renewal of war in 1803, 376 — of events during the Peninsular War, 379, *et seq.* — of the battle of Barossa, 384 — of the battle of Busaco, 385 — of the campaign of 1812, 387 — of the battle of Salamanca, 389 — of the object of the march on Madrid, 391 — of the Vittoria campaign, 393.

## T

- Tom Brown's Schooldays*, review of, 172.

## V

- Voigt, Dr.*, review of his Mittheilungen über das Unterrichtswesen Englands und Schottlands, 88.

END OF VOL. CVII.





